

A
Scholastical History
OF THE
Practice of the Church
In reference to the Administration of
BAPTISM
BY
LAYMEN.

WHEREIN

An Account is given of the Practice of
the Primitive Church, the Practice of the
modern *Greek* Church, and the Practice
of the Churches of the Reformation.

WITH

An APPENDIX containing some Remarks on
the Historical Part of Mr. *Lawrence's* Writings
touching the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, his
Preliminary Discourse of the various Opinions
of the Fathers concerning Rebaptization and
Invalid Baptisms, and his Discourse of Sacer-
dotal Powers.

By JOSEPH BINGHAM, Rector of
Headborn-Worthy, and sometime Fellow
of *University-College* in *Oxford*.

L O N D O N :

Printed by *W. Downing*, for R. KNAPLOCK at
the *Bishop's-Head* in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*.

M DCC XII.

Scholaſtical Hiſtory

OF THE

Practice of the Church

in relation to the Eſtabliſhment of

B A P T I S M

BY

J A Y M E N.

WHEREIN

An Account is given of the Practice of
the Primitive Church, the Practice of the
modern Greek Church, and the Practice
of the Churches of the Reformation.

WITH

An Appendix containing ſome Remarks on
the Hiſtorical Part of Mr. Læſtrey's Writings
concerning the Invalidity of Lay Baptiſm, his
Preliminary Diſcourſe of the various Opinions
of the Fathers concerning Reſurrection and
Invisible Baptiſm, and the Diſcourſe of ſacer-
dotal Powers.

By JOSEPH BINGHAM, Rector of
Heatham-Worſley, and ſometimes Fellow
of Univerſity College in Oxford.

L O N D O N :

Printed by B. Newbery, for R. Knapton, at
the ſign of the ſun in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

M DCC LIII.

Stadl. Bibliothek
Regensburg

i

THE
PREFACE.

THE first Design of the following Discourse, was only to have been a single Chapter of the next Volume of my *Origines Ecclesiasticae*, where the Order I have propos'd to observe in that Work will lead me next to pursue the several Offices of the ancient Liturgy and Services of the Church, and among them, in the first place, the Institution of the *Catechumens*, together with the Offices of *Baptism* and *Confirmation*. Here the Subject Matter would necessarily lead me to speak of the *Minister of Baptism*, and of *Rebaptizations*, and the *Power granted to Laymen*, in some certain Cases, to *Baptize*. But I quickly found, that to do Justice to the present Subject, especially at a time when some Controversies had been raised about it, it would be requisite to handle it a little more largely than would consist with the usual Method I have observed in my

Origines, where great variety of Matter obliges me to treat upon all Subjects as compendiously and succinctly as possible: And therefore I have chosen to treat of this one particular Subject in a separate Discourse by it self, that I might have room to enlarge upon it, and give such an Historical Account as was proper upon the present Occasion. I had observed several Mistakes to be committed, in relation to this Matter, by some late Learned Writers: And tho' I love not to enter into Dispute with any Men, yet it was necessary for me in this Discourse (with due Respect and Civility) to take notice of them: In which Case I think no Great Names so Venerable, as to be of sufficient Authority to lead others by their Dictates only, especially in Matters of Fact and History, unless they assign just Grounds and Reasons for their Assertions. Upon this Account I have taken the liberty to shew the Mistakes of the Learned Dr. *Forbes*, in reference to the Baptisms of Deacons and Laymen, and how he wrong understands the Meaning of St. *Chrysostom* and St. *Jerom*, upon those Subjects. And because, in the Point of Re-baptization, *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* has been much misrepresented, as if he were for receiving the Baptism of all Hereticks in general, without Exception, I could not but do Justice to his Character in that Respect, by setting Matters in their proper Light, tho' several Great Names, and Bp. *Pearson's* among the rest, had

had given current Credit and Authority to the contrary Opinion. I had observed also great stress laid upon the Sense of the modern *Greek Church*, and the Practice of the Churches of the Reformation, by some late Learned Writers, in reference to the Point of Laymens Baptizing in Cases of Necessity, or otherwise, to prove the Invalidity of all such Baptisms: And therefore I have made a particular Enquiry into the Judgment and Practice of all those Churches, and corrected several plain Mistakes committed in the Accounts that have been given of them, by those that have pleaded their Authority in this Behalf. I have also made a particular Enquiry into the Sense and Practice of the Church of *England*, from the beginning of the Reformation to this present time, and shewed, that she has no Rule, nor was ever understood to have any, for Rebaptizing those who, in time of Necessity, were Baptized by Laymen. And because the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics, and Excommunicate and Degraded Clerks, is a Matter of great Concern, with which the Church Universal has always been exercised; and the Church of *England* in particular has a considerable Interest depending upon the Validity of it, I have been at some Pains to enquire into the Bottom of this Question, and state it with Exactness from the ancient Writers; shewing that such Baptism, tho' given in contradiction to Authority, is not-

withstanding reputed valid; and tho' it has its Deficiencies, yet they are such as might be supplied by the Church without Rebaptization. And because it seems a great Difficulty to Account for the Legal Authority of the Church of *England* to Baptize, whilst it is confessed that she had her Baptism from the Heretical and Schismatical Church of *Rome*, I have pointed out the true Method of solving this Difficulty, by shewing that She regained her just Authority, by returning to the Unity of the Holy Catholick Church at her Reformation. And that no one might object, that there were then no visible Professors in the Holy Catholick Church, beside those of the Church of *Rome*, I have shewed that there was a very great and numerous Body of such Professors always preserved among the *Albigenses* or *Waldenses*, to the very time of the Reformation: And I have vindicated their Character, as I thought myself in Justice bound to do, from the Misrepresentations and odious Reflections which some among ourselves have unwarily, if not designedly, cast upon them. Finally, because the Writings of Mr. *Lawrence*, an Ingenious Layman, (who, out of a scruple of Conscience, desired to be rebaptized) have made great Impressions upon many, who reckon the Acuteness of his Reasonings, and the Exactness of his Historical Accounts unanswerable, I have made such Remarks upon them, as came properly in my way, to shew both

both him and the World, that he has committed several great Mistakes in Point of Ancient History; that he also frequently confounds the Terms of Lay-Baptism, Unautho- rized-Baptism, and Invalid-Baptism together, which yet in the History of the Church are Terms of very different Importance; and that he builds his whole Book upon this mistaken Foundation, supposing those Terms to be E- quivalent, which are vastly wide of one an- other. But that which I have chiefly re- marked in Mr. *Lawrence's* way of handling this Argument, is, the Fatal Tendency of the Notions he has advanced concerning the Invalidity of Heretical and Schismatical Bap- tism, which, in their direct and immediate Consequence, do Unchurch and Unbaptize the whole Church of *England*, unless it can be shewed that we had our Baptism from some other Church Originally than from the Here- tical and Schismatical Church of *Rome*. This is a Consideration so Momentous, that I hope neither Mr. *Lawrence*, nor any other who In- discriminately imbibe his Notions, will be dis- pleased at me for observing it, since so much of our Christianity depends upon it in these latter Ages of the Church. But if any Ob- loquy or Reproach befalls me for saying this, I can easily be content to receive and suffer it for the Good of the Church Universal and the Church of *England*, whose true Interests I have always been serving, by writing the

Antiquities of the one and Apologies for the other; in pursuance of both which Designs I have published the present Discourse, not only to give an Account of the Practice of the Ancient Church, but to vindicate the Just Right and Power of the Church of *England*, when under Pretence of magnifying her Power, such Arguments and Methods of Reasoning are used, as tend to overthrow her Constitution, and leave her naked, exposed, and destitute even of true Christian Baptism. Which has been the Misfortune of Mr. *Lawrence's* way of Reasoning, if I am capable of understanding him. I can readily acknowledge my great Respects for Mr. *Lawrence*, as a Man of a sharp Wit, and in many things an Acute Reasoner: And I can as heartily pity any Man in his Circumstances, who, out of a pure scruple of Conscience, doubting of the Validity of his Baptism, desires leave of the Church to be Rebaptized for Satisfaction. For in some Cases (tho' not exactly in his) where a Man doubted whether he were Baptized or not, the Primitive Church allowed of a Rebaptization, to take away all Scruples that might arise upon that Account. But when a Man uses such Arguments in his own Defence, as destroy the very Power of Baptizing in that Church from whom he desires to receive Baptism; then it would be Uncharitable to him, and Unjust to the Church, not to shew him his Errors, and vindicate the Validity of such Baptisms in the

the Church, as his Arguments tend to overthrow. And with this View only, I have made Remarks upon him, as it became one to do, to whose Province it is fall'n to explain the Laws and Practices of the Ancient Church, and assert the just Rights and Privileges of the Church of *England*.

There is one thing more I would humbly beg leave to offer, with all due Respect to the Consideration of our Superiors, legally assembled in Convocation, that is, Whether it might not be proper to have a peculiar Form of Confirmation or Imposition of Hands, for such as were Baptized by Hereticks and Schismatics, upon their Return to the Unity of the Church; considering what frequent Occasion there is for such a Form, by reason of great Multitudes that have been Baptized in Heresy or Schism, and are admitted into the Church upon Repentance and Renunciation of their Errors without Rebaptization. The ancient Church had such Forms peculiar to this Occasion: For they did not think Confirmation was to be given exactly in the same way to those who were Baptized by Hereticks or Schismatics, as they did to those that were Baptized in the Church; because tho' they did not esteem the Baptism of such to be simply Null and Invalid, yet they looked upon it as Deficient in several Respects (of which I have given a particular Account in the following

Dis-

Discourse) and therefore they appointed proper Forms for the Confirmation of such, before they admitted them to the Eucharist, upon their Return to the Church. One of these Forms, because it will give some Light in this Matter, and illustrate what I am discoursing of, I shall here subjoin, out of *De Marca*, who says * he had it from a Manuscript Collection of an Ancient Writer in the French King's Library, written above Eight-hundred Years ago. And it plainly appears to be drawn in Conformity to the Decrees of the Second General Council of *Constantinople*, and the Council of *Trullo*, which order some Heretics to be received as meer Heathens, by a new Baptism, and others only by Imposition of Hands, with the Unction of Chrism or Confirmation. The Ceremony of Receiving those of the later kind is thus described: First they are to learn the Orthodox Faith, and give themselves to Fasting and Prayer for Ten or Fifteen Days together, being instructed and disciplined after the manner of the Catechumens. Then they are publickly to Renounce and Anathematize their former Heresies, and make Profession of the Catholick Faith. After which Profession, kneeling down before the Priest, he lays his Hands upon them and recites this Prayer: "O God our Saviour, who
" wouldst have all Men to be saved, and
" come

* *De Marca Notæ ad Concilium Claromontanum*, p. 323.

“ come to the knowledge of the Truth; re-
 “ ceive this thy Servant, who is scarce yet
 “ thoroughly awakened out of Error, but de-
 “ sirous to come to the knowledge of thy
 “ Truth. For Thou hast said, *I have other*
 “ *Sheep, which are not of this Fold, and them*
 “ *I must bring, and they shall bear my Voice,*
 “ *and there shall be one Fold and one Shepherd.*
 “ Feed him with the Doctrine of thy Truth,
 “ as Thou hast revealed it by thy Holy and
 “ Glorious Apostles; vouchsafe to give him
 “ the Seal of the Divine Unction, and the In-
 “ spiration of thy Holy Spirit, and make him
 “ Partaker of the blessed Body and Blood of
 “ CHRIST: And consummate this thy Ser-
 “ vant, that he may be numbered with thy
 “ Flock, to the Glory and Praise of thy
 “ Greatness, for thine is the Kingdom and
 “ the Power.

Then anointing him with the Chrism, after the manner of those that are newly Baptized, he uses the same Form of Words as is used to them: And afterward repeats this Prayer;
 “ O Lord our God, who hast vouchsafed to
 “ Perfect and Consummate this thy Servant
 “ with the true Faith in Thee, and with the
 “ Seal of thy Holy Unction, Thou Lord of
 “ all things, keep and preserve this true Faith
 “ in him, make him to increase in Righte-
 “ ousness, and adorn him with all the Graces
 “ of thy Spirit.” After this he is admitted to partake of the Holy Eucharist.

'Tis easy to observe, that this Form of Confirmation was not for such as were baptized in the Church, but peculiar to those who were baptized in Heresy or Schism: For mention is made of their Errors in the very words of the Prayers, and they are obliged also to confess and anathematize their Heresies upon their Return to the Church. Since therefore we have no such peculiar Form in our Liturgy, I leave it to the Wisdom and Discretion of our Superiors to consider, whether such a Form might not be proper to be added to it, when the Form of Reconciling Penitents, and others of the like nature, come next under their Consideration. This was the way which the Ancient Church took to supply the Deficiencies of such Baptisms, as She thought fit to receive as Valid, tho' not every way Perfect, without Rebaptization.

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

An Account of the Practice of the Ancient Church.

§. 1. **T**HE State of the Controversy about Lay-Baptism. §. 2. The Commission given to the Apostles to Baptize; by them Communicated to others at Discretion. §. 3. Bishops invested with the same Power which the Apostles had, as their Successors. §. 4. By what Power Presbyters anciently Baptized in Ordinary or Extraordinary Cases. §. 5. Of the Power granted anciently to Deacons to Baptize. §. 6. Whether the Inferior Clergy were allowed to Baptize. §. 7. Laymen prohibited to Baptize in Ordinary Cases. §. 8. Yet allowed to do it sometimes in Cases Extraordinary. This proved from the Testimony of Tertullian. §. 9. The Council of Eliberis. §. 10. The Determination of Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, with the Consistent Testimony of Ruffin, Socrates, and Sozomon. §. 11. Of St. Jerom. §. 12. Of St. Austin. §. 13. Gelasius Bishop of Rome. §. 14. Isidore of Sevil. §. 15. The Objection from St. Chrysostom, Basil and Cyprian, answered. §. 16. Whether the Usurped and Unauthorized Baptism of Laymen was allowed to be Valid. §. 17. Of the Baptism of Women. Whether they had any Authority to Baptize. §. 18. Whether the Usurped

The CONTENTS.

surped Baptism of Women was esteemed Valid. §. 19. Whether Heretical and Schismatical Priests, and Degraded Clergymen, had any Legal Authority to Baptize. §. 20. Whether the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics was Valid. The Practice of Stephen Bishop of Rome vindicated against the Cyprianists, and shewed to be the same with that of the Post-Nicene Fathers. §. 21. What Defects the Ancients supposed to be in the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics, and how those Defects were supplied. §. 22. Whether the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics and Degraded Clergymen, be any more than the Baptism of Unauthorized Laymen. §. 23. How the Church of England comes to have Authority to Baptize, tho' she had her Baptism only from the Heretical Church of Rome. §. 24. Of the Church of Rome's allowing the Baptism of Turks, Jews, and Infidels. This shewed to be without Precedent in the Practice of the Primitive Church.

CHAP. II.

The Practice of the Modern Greeks and Moscovites.

CHAP. III.

The Practice of the Churches of the Reformation,

§. 1. **T**HE Practice of the Lutherans. §. 2. Of the Zuinglians or Helvetick Churches. §. 3. Of the Calvinists or French and Dutch Churches. §. 4. Of the Palatine Churches. §. 5. Of the Church of

THE CONTENTS.

*of England before the Conference at Hampton-Court,
and afterward.*

APPENDIX.

CONTAINING *some Remarks on the Historical part of Mr. Lawrence's Writings, touching the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, his Preliminary Discourse of the various Opinions of the Fathers concerning Rebaptization and Invalid-Baptisms, and his Discourse of Sacerdotal Powers.*

A SCHO

I

A
SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY
OF THE

Practice of the CHURCH

In reference to the
Administration of Baptism by Lay Persons

C H A P. I.

*An Account of the Practice of the Ancient
Church.*

TO understand the State of the present Controversy aright, it will be necessary, in the entrance of this Discourse, to distinguish these several Questions from one another. 1. Whether the Commission to Baptize was so given to the Apostles, as that they might communicate it to any others? 2. Whether Bishops were invested with the same Right which the Apostles had? 3. Whether the Bishops may communicate this Power only to Presbyters or Priests, as invested with Sacerdotal Powers? 4. Whether Deacons may Baptize either in ordinary or extraordinary Cases? 5. Whether the Minor Clergy, below Deacons, may have any thing of the same Power communicated to them? 6. Whether meer Lay-men,

§. I.
*The State of the
Controversy about
Lay-Baptism.*

B

who

who were never called to any Ecclesiastical Office, may promiscuously administer Baptism in ordinary Cases? 7. Whether Bishops may give them a Right to do it in extraordinary Cases of extreme Necessity? 8. Whether if they do it with or without such Commission, their Baptism be wholly Null and Invalid? 9. Whether Women may be allowed to Baptize in Cases of the like Necessity, and their Baptism be valid? 10. Whether Heretical and Schismatical Priests be any better qualified to administer Baptism than Catholick Laymen? 11. Whether their Baptism be either Legal or Valid? 12. Lastly, Whether Baptism administered by *Turks, Jews, or Infidels* be of any Account in the Christian Church? The distinct Consideration of these several Questions will take in every thing that relates to this Subject: And what I propose, is to give some Resolution of them, so far as may be collected from the general Sense and Practise of the Church, both ancient and modern; beginning first with the Practice of the Ancient Church, then examining the Rules of the Modern Greek Church, and, last of all, the Churches of the Reformation.

§. 2.

The Commission given to the Apostles to Baptize; by them communicated to others at Discretion.

To begin with the Practice of the Ancient Church. It is certain, the Commission to Baptize was originally given by our Saviour to the Eleven Apostles: For so it is expressly said, *Matt. xxviii. 16, &c. Then the Eleven Disciples went away into Galilee, into a Mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth; Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things what-*

whatsoever I have commanded you : and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World. Now, by the Tenour of this Commission it is certain, they were invested with Authority not only to Baptize themselves, but to communicate this Power to others : For the Commission and Power of Baptizing was not to die with them, but to continue to the end of the World. But then two Questions arise from hence : Whom they actually authorized to Baptize ? and, To whom they gave Commission to authorize others to Baptize ? For both these things were necessary to preserve the Church according to the Order of CHRIST, at least in future Ages. As to the first Question, it is evident from the Apostolical History, that they gave Commission to Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons to baptize : For *Philip*, who was but a Deacon, baptized the Eunuch, as we read *Acts viii. 38*. But still it remains a Question, Whether they extended this Commission to any others, either in ordinary or extraordinary Cases. The ancient Author, under the Name of *St. Ambrose^a*, was of Opinion, That the Apostles first found it necessary, for the Augmentation and Increase of the Church, to grant a General Commission to all Christians, both to Teach and Baptize : But as soon as that Necessity was over ; as soon as the World was generally converted, and Churches

B 2

erected,

^a Ambros. Com. in Ephes. 4. p. 948: Ut cresceret plebs & multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est & evangelizare & baptizare & Scripturas in Ecclesia explanare. At ubi autem omnia loca circumplexa est Ecclesia, Conventicula constituta sunt, & Rectores & cætera Officia in Ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de Clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum. Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque Diaconi in populo prædicant, neque Clerici vel Laici baptizant.

erected, Governors and other Officers were appointed in all Churches; and then this General Commission was withdrawn; so that none, even among the Clergy, was to presume to meddle with any Office to which he was not appointed. Hence it came to pass, that neither Deacons were allowed to Preach, nor the inferior Clergy, nor Laymen to Baptize. This Author seems to have been of Opinion, that the Commission which our Saviour left with his Apostles, was a Discretionary Power to authorize such others to Baptize, as they in their Wisdom, under the Direction of the Holy Ghost, should think proper to answer the present Necessities and emergent Occasions of the Church: And that therefore, as no one can have a Power of Baptizing, but he that receives, some way or other, a Commission from them; so when the Necessities of the Church requir'd it, they had Power to authorize others, besides the standing Ministers, to Baptize; which Power they both might and did Recal again, as soon as those Necessities of the Church were over. And upon this Principle it was chiefly, that the ancient Bishops of the Church allowed Deacons, and sometimes Laymen, in extraordinary Cases, to baptize: For they looked upon themselves as invested with the same Commission and Power that the Apostles had, as their Successors: that is, as has been said, not only a Power to baptize themselves, but to authorize others to baptize, either in ordinary or extraordinary Cases. By vertue of which they made Presbyters their Assistants in ordinary Cases, and used their Discretionary Power sometimes to grant Authority also to Deacons to minister Baptism in ordinary Cases, and sometimes to restrain them wholly from it, and confine them only to extraordinary Cases, and great Necessities of the Church,

Church, allowing them no other Power than what in the like Cases they allowed to Laymen. For tho' no other Writer among the Ancients has so plainly express'd his Mind upon this Point, as this Author, under the Name of St. *Ambrose*; yet it is plain, all of them who maintain'd the Power of Bishops to authorize Deacons and Laymen to Baptize, or, at their Discretion, to restrain them from it, must needs go upon the same Principle, *viz.* That such a Power was lodg'd in the hands of the Bishops of the Church, as the Apostles Successors, to authorize what Men should Baptize, and in what Cases, according as they should think necessary in their Wisdom and Discretion, for the greater or lesser Exigencies of the Church: For without this Principle it will be impossible to account for the Practice of the ancient Bishops, who sometimes restrain'd Deacons from Baptizing, as well as Laymen, and sometimes granted Authority to them both.

That thus the Matter was in Fact, is very evident from many Passages of the ancient Writers, where they speak of the original Power of administering Baptism, as lodg'd solely and entirely in the hands of the Bishops, as the Apostles immediate Successors, and Derivatively conveyed from them to others, whom they authorized to be either the standing and ordinary Ministers of Baptism, or else only the Occasional and Extraordinary Ministers of it in times of absolute Necessity, and great Exigencies of the Church. Hence it was, that anciently in many small Dioceses, Bishops were the usual and ordinary Ministers of Baptism themselves. There was but one Baptistry belonging to a City or a Diocese, and that at the Cathedral

S. 3.
Bishops invested
with the same Power
which the Apostles
had, as their Successors.

or Mother-Church, where the Bishop resided, and whither all Persons came at the two solemn Festivals, *Easter* and *Pentecost*, for Baptism. In larger Cities and Dioceses, where more Baptisteries were necessary, they were still erected by the Bishop's Appointment, and only such Persons allowed to officiate in them as had his Consent and Authority, that nothing might be done in Opposition or Contradiction to him, but in a due Subordination to him as their Superior. Thus it is remark'd by the Author of the *Pontifical*, in the Life of *Marcellus*^b, that whilst he was Bishop of *Rome*, he appointed Five and twenty Churches, as so many little Dioceses, for the convenience of baptizing Pagans upon their Conversion, and an equal number of Presbyters to minister in them. But still all these were subordinate to that one Bishop, and acted by the Authority and Commission which they receiv'd from him. So that as one of the *Roman* Councils^c expresses it, "Tho' both Presbyters and Deacons, at some solemn Times, were allowed to baptize at *Rome* in the Bishop's Presence, yet they were but Officials to him, and what they did was reckon'd his Act, and went in his Name.," 'Tis peculiarly remark'd to this purpose by one of the Bishops present

^b Pontifical. Vit. Marcelli, ap. Crabbe Concil. Tom. 1. p. 204. Hic viginti quinque Titulos in urbe Roma constituit, quasi Dioceses, propter Baptismum & Pœnitentiam multorum, qui convertebantur ex Paganis, & propter sepulturas Martyrum.

^c Conc. Rom. Can. 7. ap. Cotelier. Not. in Constitut. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 9. Paschæ tempore Presbyter & Diaconus per Parochias dare remissionem peccatorum, & ministerium implere consueverunt, etiam præsentente Episcopo: In fontem quoque ipsi descendunt, illi in Officio sunt: Sed illius nomini facti summa conceditur.

sent at the Council of *Carthage*, under *Cyprian* ^d,
 “ That CHRIST gave the Commission to his
 “ Apostles, and to them alone the Power which
 “ was given him by his Father; and that Bishops
 “ were the Apostles Successors, in governing the
 “ Church with the same Power, and granting
 “ Baptism to Believers., Hence it became a ge-
 neral and a standing Rule in the Church, that
 Presbyters and Deacons were to perform no Offi-
 ces ^e without the Authority and Consent of their
 Bishop, because the Lord’s People were commit-
 ted to his Trust, and he was to answer for their
 Souls. This was particularly specified in the
 Office of Baptism, by most of the ancient Wri-
 ters. The Rule was as old as *Ignatius*, who deli-
 vers himself after this manner, in relation to this
 Point. “ It is not lawful either to Baptize ^f or
 “ celebrate the Eucharist without the Bishop; but
 “ that which he allows is well-pleasing to GOD.
 He does not say, that no one beside the Bishop
 might administer Baptism, but that it was not
 Regularly done without his Commission or Dele-
 gation: He being the Chief Minister of Baptism,
 as well as all other Offices in the Church. In like
 manner, *Tertullian* ^g asserts the Bishop’s Original
 B 4 Right

^d Conc. Carthag. ap. Cypr. n. 79. p. 241. Manifesta est sen-
 tentia Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Apostolos suos mittentis, &
 ipsis solis potestatem à patre sibi datam permittentis; quibus
 nos successimus, eadem potestate Ecclesiam Domini gubernan-
 tes & credentium fidem baptizantes.

^e Canon. Apost. c. 39. “Ανευ γάρμονος τῆ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν
 ἐπιτελείτωσαν” &c.

^f Ignac. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. “Οὐκ ἔξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τῆ ἐπισκό-
 που, ἢ τε βαπτίζειν, ἢ τε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν. &c.

^g Terrul. de Bapt. c. 17. Dandi quidem jus habet summus sa-
 cerdos, qui est Episcopus: Dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi; non
 tamen sine Episcopi Auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem,
 quo salvo salva Pax est.

Right as Chief Priest, Independant of any other; and then the Right of Presbyters and Deacons to baptize; but this in dependance of their Bishop: For they are not to do it without his Authority, for the Honour of the Church, in the preservation of which Peace is preserved. St. *Cyprian*^h and another Bishop, one of his Contemporariesⁱ, who writes of the Baptism of Hereticks, speak of themselves as the Prime Ministers of Baptism; who only had Power to give it, with all the Ceremonies and Solemnities belonging to it: And when it was given by the Inferior Clergy, in Cases of Necessity, as to the Clinicks upon a Sick Bed, the want of those Ceremonies was either supplied by the Bishop in Confirmation, upon the Party's Recovery, or by God himself, in calling them to the State of Martyrdom. This shews, that they thought Baptism chiefly to be the Bishop's Office, and when it was done by others, it was still done by his Authority, and reputed as his Act, which he also ratified as occasion requir'd, by adding what was wanting in the Circumstances of the Solemnity, in a subsequent Confirmation. The same is also asserted by St. *Ambrose*^k, That tho' Presbyters do Baptize, yet they derive the Authority of their Ministry from the Chief Priest, that is,

^h Cypr. de Exhort. Martyr. in Præfat. p. 168. Nos tantum, qui Domino permittente primum baptisma credentibus dedimus, ad aliud quoque singulos præparemus.

ⁱ Anonym. de Bapt. Hæreticorum, ad calcem Cypriani. p. 26. Siquidem per nos baptisma tradetur, integre & solenniter & per omnia quæ scripta sunt adsignetur, atque sine ulla ullius rei separatione tradatur: aut si à Minore Clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, eventum expectemus, ut aut suppleatur à nobis, aut à Domino supplendum reservetur.

^k Ambros. de Sacram. Lib. 3. c. 1. Licet Presbyteri fecerint, tamen Exordium Ministerii à summo est Sacerdote.

is, the Bishop. And the Author of the Comments upon *St. Paul's Epistles*¹, under the Name of *St. Ambrose*, says in general, none of the Clergy were to meddle with any Office, to which they were not appointed. But no one expresses himself more fully or plainly upon this Head than *St. Jerom*: "The Welfare^m of the Church, says he, "depends upon the Dignity and Veneration "of the Chief Priest; on whom, if there was not "some extraordinary and eminent Power conferred, there would be as many Schisms in the "Church as there are Priests. Hence it is, that "neither Presbyters nor Deacons have any Right "to baptize without the Chrism and Command "of their Bishop.," So that this Point was clear among the Ancients, beyond all Dispute, that Presbyters had only a Derivative and Subordinate Power to baptize as well as others; and so long as they kept to this Rule, their Baptisms were Regular and Lawful, as done in Conformity to the establish'd Rules and Orders of the Church: But if they set themselves in opposition to their Bishop, and either acted without or against his Consent, as absolute and independant of him, then their Baptisms and all their other Offices and Ministrations were Irregular and Unlawful, because done in a Schismatical way, and in a profest contempt

¹ Ambros. in Ephes. 4. p. 948. Rectores & cætera Officia in Ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de Clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum.

^m Hieron. Dial. cum Lucifer. c. 4. Ecclesiæ salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate ac veneratione consistit: cui si non exors quædam & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiis efficientur Schismata quot Sacerdotes. Inde ideo venit ut sine Chrismate & Jussione Episcopi, neque Presbyter neque Diaconus jus habeant baptizandi.

tempt of Authority, and all the standing Rules and Laws of the Church.

§. 4. By what Power Presbyters anciently baptized, in ordinary or extraordinary Cases. Yet tho' such Baptisms were very sinful and irregular in respect of the Persons ministring, they were not esteem'd to be utterly void and null in respect of the Persons baptiz'd. Whence it follows, that a plain Distinction must needs have been made always between the Irregularity and the Invalidity of any Baptism; since the want of a Lawful Commission and Authority would render the Act of Administration sinful and irregular, but not absolutely Invalid. It is therefore here very material to enquire into this, How it came to pass, that Baptism ministr'd by a Presbyter Illegally and without Commission, was nevertheless esteem'd Valid, notwithstanding the sinfulness of the Act of Ministration. 'Tis resolv'd by some into the Indelible Character and Power of the Priesthood, which is given to a Presbyter at his Ordination, by which they think all his Ministerial Acts stand good, tho' done in an Irregular manner, against the Laws and Canons of the Church; and that a Priest cannot be divested of this Power, after he is once legally ordain'd to it. But this could not be the Ground upon which the Ancients went, for several Reasons. 1. Because they did not suppose Baptism founded wholly upon Sacerdotal Powers, nor tied so absolutely to the Office of a Priest, but that it might, in ordinary Cases also, be ministr'd by Deacons, if they had the Bishop's Commission; and by Laymen, in extraordinary Cases of Pressing Necessity, if they had the Bishop's License and Authority to do it, as we shall see hereafter. 2. The Indelible Character of a Priest does not authorize or qualify

lify him to act contrary to the Commission of his Bishop: For then his Baptizing would be both Authorized and Unauthorized, Regular and Irregular, Lawful and Unlawful at the same time, and in the very same Act and Respect, which is a manifest Contradiction. Then also a Priest could never be Deposed from his Office, or have his Commission recalled, or his Function legally taken from him, be his Crimes never so great, and deserving Ecclesiastical Censure: Once a Priest he would be always a Priest, and they who gave him his Commission would have no Authority to withdraw his Commission, and reduce him to the State of a Layman, in the most urgent and necessary Case that could be conceiv'd: Which is contrary to the whole Tenour of Ecclesiastical Discipline, and quite cuts the Sinews of Episcopal Power in the Church. For these Reasons it is evident, the Ancients could not think the Legal Power of Baptizing belonged to a Man, barely as he was a Priest, but as he was a Man invested with such Power by his Legal Superior, whether he was Priest or Deacon; and that Power subject to certain Laws, which if he did not observe, his Acts were Irregular and Unlawful; and if he persisted obstinately to contradict such Rules, the same Superior who gave him his Legal Authority to Baptize, had a Legal Power to withdraw it again, and exclude him from the ordinary exercise of any Office of the Ecclesiastical Function. Whence it follows, that the Irregular Baptisms of such Priests being esteem'd Valid, so as not to be repeated, tho' Irregularly and Unlawfully given, could not be thought Valid upon the Notion of their being once ordain'd Priests, and having an Indelible Character of the Priesthood upon them; but upon some other Notion and Foundation, which

which equally extended to Deacons as well as Priests, and made the Baptism of a Deacon, tho' Irregularly and Unlawfully perform'd, as valid as that of a Priest in the same Circumstances: And that must be upon one of these two Grounds, either that Baptism by whomsoever Christian performed, was Valid and not to be repeated, provided it was done with due Matter and Form; or else that the Bishops of the Church, as Chief Ministers of Baptism, had Power to receive and confirm those Baptisms, which were otherwise Irregularly, and in opposition to their Authority and Commission perform'd in the Church. But however it was, this is certain, that the Validity of an Irregular Priest's Baptism was not owing to his Indelible Character; since the Baptism of Deacons and Laymen, who had not the Character of Priests, was sometimes authorized and allowed as valid; which is evident from plain Matters of Fact, which I now proceed to give a farther account of.

S. 5.
Of the Power
granted anciently to
Deacons to baptize.

Deacons, by some ancient Canons, are invested with the Power of Baptizing in ordinary Cases, as well as Priests. It is plain, *Tertullian* so understood it: For he puts Presbyters and Deacons together, as the ordinary Ministers of Baptism next after the Bishop, and under his Direction: He makes no Distinction in the Power given to those two Orders; for the one had as much Power to baptize as the other, and they both alike subordnately acted under the Bishop, in whom, as Chief Priest,

n *Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17.* Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus: Dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi; non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, &c.

Priest, the Original Power of Baptizing was lodged, and from whose Authority they received their Power. St. *Jerom*^o was of the same Mind; for he says, “without the Commission of the Bishop, neither Presbyter nor Deacon had any Right to baptize:”, which implies, That by his Commission they had each of them the Ordinary Power. Thus it was in the Churches of *Spain*, at the time of the Council of *Eliberis*, in one of whose Canons^p there is a Provision made, That if a Deacon, who presides over a People, shall baptize any Persons without a Bishop or Presbyter, the Bishop in that Case shall perfect what was wanting in the Ceremony by his Benediction. It is not said he shall Rebaptize them, because they were only baptized by a Deacon; but he shall ratify the Baptism by his consummating Act, which was his Imposition of Hands in Confirmation. From whence it is evident, that Deacons in *Spain* were then allowed to be the Ordinary Ministers of Baptism. The same appears from St. *Cyril's*^q Catechetical Discourses, to have been the Custom of the Churches in *Palestine*: For he tells his Catechumens, when the time of Baptism came, they might go either to Bishops, or Presbyters, or Deacons: “For the Grace of God was to be had in Villages as well as Cities, and came upon the Unlearned as well as Learned, upon Bond as well as Free; seeing that Grace was not

^o Hieron. Dial. cum Lucifer. c. 4. Sine Jussione Episcopi neque Presbyter neque Diaconus jus habent baptizandi.

Ibid. In Villulis, & Castellis, & remotioribus locis per Presbyteros & Diaconos baptizati, &c.

^p Conc. Eliber. c. 77. Si quis Diaconus regens Plebem, sine Episcopo vel Presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, Episcopus eos per Benedictionem perficere debebit.

^q Cyril. Catech. 17. n. 17.

“not from Men, but a Gift of God by the hand
 “of Men.” This denotes, that Deacons in Coun-
 try-Villages had the Ordinary Power of Baptizing.
 And so we find in the first Council^r of *Orleance*,
 a Decree, implying, That the same Power was
 allowed them in the *French Churches*. For in one
 of the Canons of that Council Deacons and Pres-
 byters are join’d together as Ministers of Baptism,
 both in Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases: For
 it is said, That if a Deacon or a Presbyter shall,
 for any private Guilt, have withdrawn himself
 from the Communion of the Altar, under the
 Profession of a Penitent, yet, even in that case,
 such a Deacon or Presbyter, if there happen a
 Case of evident Necessity, and no others can be
 had, may baptize any Man that desires Baptism.
 Certainly they who authorized Deacons in such
 singular Circumstances and Disadvantages to bap-
 tize, even when they were under a sort of Disci-
 pline and Penance, must needs allow them the
 same Privilege as Presbyters had to baptize in all
 other ordinary Cases. Yet some other ancient
 Rules seem absolutely to forbid Deacons to mini-
 ster Baptism in ordinary Cases, confining the Of-
 fice only to Bishops and Presbyters. Among those
 called the Apostolical Canons there are four that
 speak of the Ministers of Baptism, and those are
 there only Bishops and Presbyters, but no men-
 tion is made of Deacons. One Canon^f says,
 If a Bishop or Presbyter receives the Baptism of
 Hereticks, he is to be deposed. Another says,
 If

^r Conc. Aurel. 1. c. 14. Si Diaconus vel Presbyter pro reatu
 suo se ab altaris communione sub penitentis professione sub-
 moverit; sic quoque, si alii defuerint, & causa certæ necessi-
 tatis exoritur poscentem baptismum liceat baptizare.

^s Canon Apost. 46.

If ^t a Bishop or Presbyter rebaptizes one that has been truly baptized before, or does not baptize again one that has been prophanely polluted in Baptism by the Impious, he shall be deposed, as one that derides the Cross and Death of CHRIST, and makes no difference between true and false Priests. Another Canon ^u says, If any Bishop or Presbyter observe not the Form of Baptism prescrib'd by our Lord, In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but baptizes in the Name of Three Unoriginated Principles, or Three Sons, or Three Holy Ghosts, he shall be deposed. And a fourth Canon ^w also pronounces the same Censure against any Bishops or Presbyters, who did not use three Immersions in the Sacred Mystery. In all these Canons there is not the least mention of Deacons, because by them only Bishops and Priests are supposed to be the Ordinary Ministers of Baptism, and not Deacons. So likewise in the Constitutions under the Name of the Apostles, all the Inferior Clergy, among which the Deacons are comprehended, are prohibited to minister Baptism: "We do not permit, say they, " ^x the rest of the Clergy to baptize, as Readers, " Singers, Doorkeepers, Subdeacons, but only Bishops and Presbyters, to whom the Deacons " are to minister. And they that presume to act " otherwise, shall bear the Judgment of Corab and " his Company., The Deacons are here wholly excluded from the Office of Baptism, as well as the rest of the Inferior Clergy: And in some ancient

^t Canon Apost. 47. ^u Ibid. Can. 49. ^w Ibid. Can. 50.

^x Constit. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 11. 'Αλλ' ἔτε τοῖς λοιποῖς κληρικοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν βαπτίζειν· οἷον ἀναγνώταις, ἢ ψάλταις, ἢ πυλωροῖς, ἢ ὑπηρέταις, ἢ (Leg. ἀλλ' ἢ) μόνοις ἐπισκόποις, καὶ πρεσβυτέροις, ἐξυπηρετήματων αὐτοῖς καὶ διακόνων.

ancient Copies they were excluded by Name; for in *Georgius Hamartolus* Citation of this Passage, as *Cotelerius* ^y has observ'd, the Prohibition names Deacons expressly among the rest that are forbidden to baptize; and if they had not been excepted by Name, yet it were so to be understood: For he that confines Baptism only to the Office of Bishops and Presbyters, must be supposed thereby to exclude Deacons, unless it be pretended that Deacons are of the same Order either with Bishops or Presbyters; which the Constitutions are so far from asserting, that they make Deacons only Ministers to the other two Orders. But in another place, the Constitutions speak yet more expressly against Deacons baptizing: For they thus distinguish ^z the Offices of Presbyter and Deacon from each other; "A Presbyter is to
 "Teach, to Offer the Eucharist, to Baptize, and
 "to give the Blessing to the People; but a Dea-
 "con is only to minister to the Bishop and the
 "Presbyters, and not to perform the rest., And
 again, ^a "A Deacon does not give the Blessing,
 "but receive it from the Bishop or the Presbyter:
 "He does not Baptize; he does not offer the Eu-
 "charist; but when the Bishop or Presbyter has
 "offered, he distributes it to the People, not as
 "a Priest, but as one that ministers to the Priests.,
 Yet, notwithstanding this, 'tis asserted by the same
 Author ^b, That a Deacon may baptize, if he has
 a Commission and Authority from his Bishop to
 do it, as he supposes *Philip* the Deacon, and *Ana-*
nias to have had a special Call from God. "If
 "any one, says he, shall plead the Example of
 "Philip

^y Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 9.

^z Constit. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 20.

^a Ibid. Lib. 8. c. 28.

^b Ibid. Lib. 8. c. 46.

“ *Philip* the Deacon, and *Ananias* the Faithful Brother; the one of which baptiz’d the Eunuch, and the other me *Paul*; they understand not what we say: For we say, that no Man takes to himself the Dignity of the Priesthood, but either he is called of GOD, as *Melchizedec* and *Job*; or he receives it from the Chief Priest, as *Aaron* from *Moses*. Therefore *Philip* and *Ananias* did not appoint themselves, but were chosen by CHRIST the Chief Priest, the Incomparable GOD.,, St. *Chrysostom* seems to have been of the same Opinion, That the Ordinary Office of Baptizing belonged only to Priests, and not to Deacons, tho’ Deacons, in Cases of Necessity, might do it. In his Discourses of the Priesthood he thus argues for, and magnifies the Power of the Priest: “ ’Tis plain Madness to despise so great a Power, without which we cannot obtain Salvation, or the good things that are promised us. For if no one can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, except he be born of Water and the Holy Ghost; and he that eateth not the Flesh of the Lord, and drinketh not his Blood, is deprived of eternal Life; and all these things are perform’d by no other^c but those sacred Hands, I mean the Hands of the Priest: How can any one, without these, either escape the Fire of Hell, or obtain the Crown that is laid up in Heaven?,, ’Tis certain St. *Chrysostom*, in these words, excludes Deacons from the Ordinary Power of Baptizing, as much as he does Laymen. Which the Learned Dr. *Forbes*^d, who first produc’d this Passage against

C

Lay-

^c Chryf. de Sacerdot. Lib. 3. c. 5. Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα δι᾽ ἑτέρου μὴ ἐξ ἐνός, μόνον δὲ διὰ τῶν ἀγίων ἐκείνων ἐπιτελεῖται χειρῶν, τῶν τοῦ ἱερέως λέγων &c.

^d Forbes Instruct. Histor. Theol. Lib. 10. c. 14. n. 12:

Lay-baptism, was so sensible of, that he equally concludes the Baptism of Deacons to be Invalid, as well as that of Laymen. But he mistakes St. Chrysostom's Meaning; for he did not intend so to confine Baptism to the Hands of a Priest, as to make it simply and absolutely unlawful, in any Case whatsoever, for a Deacon to administer it: For, in case of Necessity, he not only permits, but positively enjoins Deacons to baptize. "For, says he, "if there be a necessity, and a Child be "found unbaptized, and ready to die, it is e law-
 "ful for a Deacon to baptize it., Which shews, that he only made Priests the Ordinary Ministers of Baptism; and that it was the contempt of their Ministry only, when it might be had, which he so inveighs against, and not the bare want of it, when it could not be had in Cases extraordinary and of extreme Necessity, in which it might be supply'd by a Deacon. And this must be the meaning of Epiphanius.^f, when he says, that "Deacons are not permitted to celebrate any My-
 "stery or Sacrament in the Church, but only to
 "minister in the Celebration., that is, They were not to do it in Ordinary Cases, when a Priest was at hand, but only to assist the Priest, as the principal Agent, in the performance of it. St. Hilary^g was of the same Mind: For he reckons Baptism a part of the Apostolical Office and Ministry,

e Chrys. Hom. 61. Tom. 7. Edit. Savil. p. 423. Ἐὰν γένηται ἀνάγκη, καὶ εὐρεθῇ παιδίον ἀβαπτιστὸν, καὶ μέλλῃ τελευτᾶν, ἔξδὲν τὸν διάκονον βαπτίσαι.

f Epiphan. Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 4. Καὶ γὰρ ὅτε διάκονοι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ τάξει ὁπσιεύθησάν τι μυστήριον ὀπίσσεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μόνον διακονεῖν τὰ ἐπιτελέμενα.

g Hilar. Com. in Psal. 67. p. 242. Sacramentum ipsum Baptismi adeo impatientis desiderii cupiditate præveniens, ut à Diacono ministerium Apostolici Officii, salutis suæ cupidus, exigeret.

nistry, and that it was therefore only an extraordinary Exigence that made *Philip* the Deacon baptize the Eunuch, who had such an impatient desire of Baptism, that he could not stay to be baptiz'd by an Apostle. The Canons of the Church are many times peremptory against Deacons baptizing in Ordinary Cases, but they always except the Case of Necessity, the time of Sicknes, and Disability or want of other Ministers. Among the Decrees of *Gelasius* ^h this is one: "Let not a Deacon presume to baptize without the Bishop or Presbyter, unless they be far absent, and an extreme Necessity compel him: In which Cases it is sometimes allow'd to Lay-Christians to do it.," *Cotelerius* ⁱ and *Sirmond* give us a Canon out of one of the *Roman Councils*, which forbids Deacons to baptize at any other time beside *Easter*: But at that time Deacons, as well as Presbyters, are allow'd to grant Remission of Sins; that is, to baptize in the Parish-Churches: At other times, even in Case of Sicknes, none but a Presbyter is authoriz'd to do it,

C 2

be-

^h *Gelas. Ep. 9. ad Episc. Lucan. c. 9. Absque Episcopo vel Presbytero baptizare non præsumat Diaconus; nisi prædictis fortasse Officiis longius constitutis, necessitas extrema compellat: Quod & Laicis Christianis facere plerumque conceditur.*

ⁱ *Conc. Rom. Can. 7. ap. Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 9. Paschæ tempore Presbyter & Diaconus per Parochias dare Remissionem peccatorum, & ministerium implere consueverunt, etiam præsentem Episcopo: in Fontem quoque ipsi descendunt, illi in officio sunt: Sed illius nomini facti summa conceditur. Reliquis vero temporibus, ubi ægritudinis necessitas consequi unumquemque compellit, specialiter Presbytero licentia est per salutaris aquæ gratiam dare indulgentiam peccatorum, quoniam & munus ipsi licet, causâ mundationis, offerre: Diaconis vero nulla licentia invenitur esse concessa; sed quod semel forte contigit usurpare, per necessitatem dicuntur excusati, &c.*

because he only had power to offer the Oblation. The reason of this difference in the *Roman* Church seems to have been this: That in a great and populous City, where there were many Churches and many Presbyters, and but seven Deacons, there could never scarce any such Case of Necessity happen by the sickness of a Catechumen, but that a Presbyter might be had, rather than a Deacon, to give him Baptism: but at the solemn time of *Easter* such Multitudes came together at once to be Baptiz'd, that the Bishop and all his Presbyters were hardly sufficient to perform the whole Ministry, and therefore Deacons, in that Exigence, were taken in to be their Assistants. Where we may observe two things; *First*, That they did this by the Bishop's License and Authority: And, *Secondly*, that only in a time of great Exigence, when a Case of Necessity requir'd it. *Isidore* of *Sevil*, who wrote a considerable time after this, observes the like of Deacons ministering Baptism in the Age he liv'd in. "It is evident, says he, ^k that the Ministry of Baptism belongs only to Priests; nor is it lawful for Deacons themselves to perform the Mystery without the Bishop or a Presbyter: unless in their absence, when the extreme necessity of Sickness requires and compels them to do it: In which case it is often permitted to faithful Laymen.,, And thus it continu'd for many Ages after in the *English* Church, as appears from the

^k *Isidor. de Offic. Lib. 2. c. 24. Constat baptisma solis Sacerdotibus esse tractandum; ejusque mysterium nec ipsis Diaconis explere est licitum absque Episcopo vel Presbytero: nisi his procul absentibus, ultima languoris necessitas cogat. Quod & Laicis fidelibus plerumque permittitur, &c.*

the Canons of the Council of *York*^l, held in the Year 1195; and the Council of *London*^m, in the Year 1200; and the Canons of *St. Edmund*, *An.* 1236. mention'd in *Linwood's*ⁿ *Provincial*. In all which Deacons are forbidden to baptize, except upon urgent Necessity, when the Priest cannot, or is absent, or through Folly and Indiscretion will not, and a Child or a sick Person is in imminent danger of Death. And so it was in some parts of the *Greek Churches* in former Ages, as is clear from *St. Chrysostom's* Testimony alledg'd before; and from *Theodoret*^o, who says, when a Presbyter was not at hand, if a pressing Necessity requir'd, even a Deacon was compel'd to give Baptism to any one that wanted it. He might not then do it Ordinarily, but only in Cases of Necessity, when a Presbyter or Priest could not be found to do it. And so it continu'd to be the Rule of the Church of *Constantinople* for several Ages after; as we learn from the Canons of *Nicephorus* the Patriarch in the Ninth Century, where, in extraordinary Cases of Necessity^p, a simple Monk and a Deacon are equally qualified to baptize. Which implies, that neither of them

C 3

were

^l Conc. Eboracen. c. 5. Diaconus non baptizet, nec corpus Christi cuiquam eroget, nisi gravi necessitate urgente. ap. Roger. Hoveden. Hist. an. 1195. & Concil. Tom. 10.

^m Conc. London. c. 3.

ⁿ Linwood Provinc. Lib. 3. Tit. 24. de Baptismo. Præcipimus quod Diaconi baptizare non præsumant, nisi in his casibus, cum sacerdos non potest, vel absens est, vel stulte vel indigne non vult, & mors imminet puero vel ægroto.

^o Theodor. Com. in 2 Paralipom. cap. 29. Q. 1. p. 389. Πρεσβύτερος ἢ πρεβύτης, καὶ τῆς χρείας ἐπιγνώσεως, ἀναγκάζεται καὶ διάκονος προσφέρειν τὸ δεομένῳ τὸ βάπτισμα.

^p Nicephor. Can. 13. ap. Leunclavium Jur. Græc. Rom. Tom. 1. Lib. 3. p. 196. Κατὰ πείρασιν καὶ μοναχὸς λιτὸς βαπτίζει ὡσαύτως καὶ διάκονος κατὰ πείρασιν βαπτίζει.

were qualified to do it in Ordinary Cases : For the simple Monks were not in Holy Orders, but properly Laymen, being opposed to those whom the *Greeks* called *ισχυρονοχοι*, or Monks in Sacred Orders, who pertain'd to the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and Function ; as I have more fully shew'd in another place ⁹. Now then Deacons being join'd with simple Monks, could not be suppos'd to be the Ordinary Ministers of Baptism, but only qualify'd to do it in extraordinary Cases. Hence it is most evident, That so many of the Ancients as excluded Deacons from the Ordinary ministration of Baptism, did it upon this Supposition, that the Ordinary Ministration of Baptism was the proper Office of the Priests or Presbyters alone, who were a superior Order above Deacons : but yet, that in Cases of extreme Necessity it was lawful for others, besides Priests, to minister Baptism by the Bishop's Authority ; and upon this Ground, in such Cases, it was esteem'd also the Office of Deacons. So necessary, we see, was this Distinction between Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases, to adjust Matters in the practice of the Primitive Church, whilst, on the one hand, the Honour and Dignity of the Priesthood was to be preserv'd, and yet Deacons allowed, on the other hand, to minister Baptism in some Cases, though they were not Priests in the strict sense, in the Opinion of those who allow'd them to do it.

§. 6.

Whether the Inferior Clergy were allowed to baptize.

The next Question is concerning Subdeacons, and the rest of the Inferior Orders, who went by the Name of the Minor

⁹ Origin. Eccles. Lib. 7. cap. 2. n. 7. &c.

nor Clergy in the Primitive Church. These were not properly of Divine, but only of Ecclesiastical Institution, for helps to the superior Clergy in their Ministration, as has been fully prov'd against the Romanists ^r in another Book. Now the Question about these at present is, Whether in any Cases they had Power to baptize? That they had no Power in Ordinary Cases, is evident from what has been before discoursed of Deacons: For if Deacons themselves had not generally such a Power allow'd them, it would be absurd to think that the Inferior Orders below them should have it. The Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* ^f excludes them all by Name from this Office, Readers, Singers, Doorkeepers, Subdeacons, threatening them with the Punishment of *Corah*, if they presum'd to invade it. But this is to be understood of the Ordinary Ministration of Baptism, from which Deacons also were excluded. The Question then runs out farther, Whether in any extraordinary Cases they were allow'd to give it? But there are few among the Ancients that have, in direct Terms, decided this Question; so we must judge only by parity of Reason what they thought upon it. The ancient Author of the Book concerning the Baptism of Hereticks, publish'd by *Rigaltius* and Bishop *Fell*, among the Works of St. *Cyprian*, seems to say, that the Minor Clergy ^t, in Cases of Necessity, might baptize. But Learned Men are not agreed what that Author means by the Minor Clergy. *Cotelerius* ^u and

C 4 Vale-

^r Origin. Eccles. Lib. 3. cap. 1.

^f Constit. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 11. So Ambros. Com. in Ephes.

4. Neque Clerici vel Laici baptizant.

^t Anonym. de Bapt. Hæret. ad calcem Cypriani, p. 26. Si a Minore Clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, &c.

^u Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 9.

Valesius^w are of Opinion, that it signifies all the Inferior Clergy below Bishops and Presbyters. And, if so, it were a plain Proof indeed that the Inferior Clergy, in Cases of Necessity, might baptize. But *Rigaltius* and Bishop *Fell*, in their Notes upon the place, think the Minor Clergy only means Presbyters and Deacons, who were called so in respect of the Bishop their Superior, who commonly administer'd Baptism himself, and when he could not do it in Person, gave his Commission to Presbyters and Deacons in his stead. I will not venture to decide so nice a Controversy between these Learned Men: But I think the main Question may easily be decided another way: For if the Ancients granted Liberty to meer Monks and Laymen to baptize, in extraordinary Cases, it will readily follow, that they would never scruple to grant the same Power to the Inferior Clergy, who were, at least, one Degree above Monks and Laymen. We cannot therefore better determine this Question, than by proceeding to that other, concerning the Power granted to Laymen in reference to the Administration of Baptism, which is the grand Question in this whole Affair.

§. 7.
*Laymen prohibited
 to baptize in ordinary
 Cases.*

Now here first of all it is certain, that Laymen were always debar'd from meddling with the Administration of Baptism in all Ordinary Cases. All the former Allegations, which make it the proper Office of Bishops and Presbyters, even to the exclusion of Deacons, are certainly of much greater Force against the Usurpations of Laymen. Besides, they are sometimes

^w Vales. Not. in Euseb. Lib. 6. c. 43.

times prohibited in particular by Name: As in the *Apostolical Constitutions* three times at least. “ We
 “ do not permit Laymen to perform * any Sacer-
 “ dotal Office, as the Sacrifice of the Eucharist,
 “ or Baptism, or Imposition of Hands, or the les-
 “ ser or the greater Benediction: For no Man
 “ taketh this Honour to himself, but he that is
 “ called of G O D. This Dignity is given only
 “ by the Laying on of the Bishop’s Hands; but
 “ he that takes it to himself without Commission,
 “ shall sustain the Punishment of *Uzzias*. „ The
 Author, under the Name of St. *Ambrose* y, says
 therefore, That from the time of the Apostles,
 the Inferior Clergy and Laymen were prohibited
 to baptize. Which, at least, must be understood
 of a prohibition to usurp the Office, and do it in
 Ordinary Cases,

But still the grand Question
 remains, Whether ever they
 were allowed to do it in Ex-
 traordinary Cases of extreme
 Necessity, when no publick Minister could be
 procur’d to do it? And this must be resolv’d in
 the affirmative, as to the general practice of the
 Church, tho’ there are some Exceptions of par-
 ticular Churches to the contrary. *Tertullian*, I
 think, is the first Writer that speaks directly to
 this Point, and he delivers himself thus upon the
 Matter: “ The Chief Priest, who is the Bishop,
 “ has

§. 8:

*Yet allowed to do
 it sometimes in Cases
 extraordinary.*

* Const. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 10. Οὐτε λαϊκοῖς ὀπιτρεσπομεν
 ποιειν π τῶν ιερατικῶν ἔργων· ὁιον θυσιαν, ἢ βάπτισμα, ἢ
 χειροθεσίαν, ἢ εὐλογίαν μικρὰν ἢ μεγάλην. &c.

Vid. Const. Apost. Lib. 2. c. 27. It. Lib. 8. c. 46.

y Ambros. Com. in Ephes. 4. p. 948. Hinc ergo est, unde
 nunc neque Diaconi in populo prædicant, neque Clerici vel
 Laici baptizant.

Valesius^w are of Opinion, that it signifies all the Inferior Clergy below Bishops and Presbyters. And, if so, it were a plain Proof indeed that the Inferior Clergy, in Cases of Necessity, might baptize. But *Rigaltius* and Bishop *Fell*, in their Notes upon the place, think the Minor Clergy only means Presbyters and Deacons, who were called so in respect of the Bishop their Superior, who commonly administer'd Baptism himself, and when he could not do it in Person, gave his Commission to Presbyters and Deacons in his stead. I will not venture to decide so nice a Controversy between these Learned Men: But I think the main Question may easily be decided another way: For if the Ancients granted Liberty to meer Monks and Laymen to baptize, in extraordinary Cases, it will readily follow, that they would never scruple to grant the same Power to the Inferior Clergy, who were, at least, one Degree above Monks and Laymen. We cannot therefore better determine this Question, than by proceeding to that other, concerning the Power granted to Laymen in reference to the Administration of Baptism, which is the grand Question in this whole Affair.

§. 7.
Laymen prohibited
to baptize in ordinary
Cases.

Now here first of all it is certain, that Laymen were always debar'd from meddling with the Administration of Baptism in all Ordinary Cases. All the former Allegations, which make it the proper Office of Bishops and Presbyters, even to the exclusion of Deacons, are certainly of much greater Force against the Usurpations of Laymen. Besides, they are sometimes

^w Vales. Not. in Euseb. Lib. 6. c. 43.

times prohibited in particular by Name: As in the *Apostolical Constitutions* three times at least. “ We
 “ do not permit Laymen to perform * any Sacer-
 “ dotal Office, as the Sacrifice of the Eucharist,
 “ or Baptism, or Imposition of Hands, or the les-
 “ ser or the greater Benediction: For no Man
 “ taketh this Honour to himself, but he that is
 “ called of GOD. This Dignity is given only
 “ by the Laying on of the Bishop’s Hands; but
 “ he that takes it to himself without Commission,
 “ shall sustain the Punishment of *Uzzias*. „ The
 Author, under the Name of St. *Ambrose* y, says
 therefore, That from the time of the Apostles,
 the Inferior Clergy and Laymen were prohibited
 to baptize. Which, at least, must be understood
 of a prohibition to usurp the Office, and do it in
 Ordinary Cases,

But still the grand Question
 remains, Whether ever they
 were allowed to do it in Ex-
 traordinary Cases of extreme
 Necessity, when no publick Minister could be
 procur’d to do it? And this must be resolv’d in
 the affirmative, as to the general practice of the
 Church, tho’ there are some Exceptions of par-
 ticular Churches to the contrary. *Tertullian*, I
 think, is the first Writer that speaks directly to
 this Point, and he delivers himself thus upon the
 Matter: “ The Chief Priest, who is the Bishop,
 “ has

§. 8:
*Yet allowed to do
 it sometimes in Cases
 extraordinary.*

* Const. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 10. Οὐτε λαϊκοῖς ὀπιτρέπομεν
 ποιεῖν π τῶν ἱερατικῶν ἔργων· οἷον θυσίαν, ἢ βάπτισμα, ἢ
 χειροθεσίαν, ἢ εὐλογίαν μικρὰν ἢ μεγάλην. &c.

Vid. Const. Apost. Lib. 2. c. 27. It. Lib. 8. c. 46.

y Ambros. Com. in Ephes. 4. p. 948. Hinc ergo est, unde
 nunc neque Diaconi in populo prædicant, neque Clerici vel
 Laici baptizant.

“ has power to give Baptism, and after him Pres-
 “ byters and Deacons, yet not without the Au-
 “ thority of the Bishop, for the Honour of the
 “ Church, in the preservation of which Peace is
 “ preserved. In another respect Laymen have
 “ also a Right to give it ; for what is received
 “ in common, may be given in common. Baptism
 “ is GOD’s Peculiar, and may be conferred by all.
 “ But Laymen are in a much greater degree
 “ obliged by the Rules of Modesty in the use of
 “ their power, since they who are superior to
 “ them, are obliged not to assume to themselves
 “ the Office which belongs to the Bishop only.
 “ Emulation is the Mother of Strife. All things
 “ are lawful, says the Holy Apostle, but all things
 “ are not expedient. Therefore it ought to suf-
 “ fice them to use this power in Necessities, when
 “ the condition of the Place, or Time, or Person
 “ requires it : For then their charitable Assistance
 “ is accepted, when the circumstance of one in
 “ danger presses them to it. And in this case he
 “ would be guilty of a Man’s Destruction that
 “ omitted to do what he lawfully might., Mr.
Dodwel

z Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. Alioquin etiam Laicis jus est.
 Quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari potest ; nisi Epis-
 copi jam aut Presbyteri aut Diaconi vocantur, dicentes, Domini
 sermo non debet abscondi ab ullo. Proinde & baptismus æque
 Dei census ab omnibus exerceri potest : Sed quanto magis
 Laicis disciplina verecundiæ & modestiæ incumbit, cum ea
 Majoribus competat, ne sibi adsumant dicatum Episcopis offi-
 cium Episcopatus ? Æmulatio schismatum mater est. Omnia
 licere, dixit sanctissimus Apostolus, sed non omnia expedire.
 Sufficiat scilicet, in necessitatibus ut utaris ; sicubi aut Loci,
 aut Temporis, aut Personæ conditio compellit. Tunc enim
 constantia succurrentis excipitur, cum urget circumstantia pe-
 riclitantis. Quoniam reus erit perditioni hominis, si supersederit
 præstare quod libere poterit.

Dodwel^a and some others except against this passage of *Tertullian*, as expressing only his own private Opinion, and not the common practice of the Church. But no Learned Man before ever thought so, as Mr. *Dodwel* himself confesses, and acknowledges his own Opinion to be a paradox. And there is this prejudice against it from the coherence of *Tertullian's* Discourse: That in the former part of it he is certainly speaking of the practice of the Church, when he says, Presbyters and Deacons act by the Bishop's Authority when they administer Baptism in Ordinary Cases. It would be strange then if he should invert his Discourse immediately in the next words, and not mean the practice of the Church, when he comes to speak of Laymen. But however this be, *Tertullian's* sense was in the next Age confirm'd by some publick Acts of the Church.

About an hundred Years after *Tertullian*, the Spanish Bishops assembled in the Council of *Eli-*

S. 9.
*The Testimony of the
Council of Eliberis.*

beris^b made a publick Decree about this matter: They there appointed, That when Men were upon a Voyage at Sea, or in any place where no Church was near at hand, if a Catechumen happen'd to be extremely Sick, and at the point of Death, that then any Christian who had his own Baptism entire, and was no Bigamist, might baptize him. This Authority was not given to all Christians in all Cases, but with several Limitations and Restrictions. 1. It must be a case of abso-

^a *Dodwel. de Jure Laicorum Sacerdotali, cap. 2. n. 2. p. 52.*

^b *Conc. Eliber. can. 38. Peregre navigantes, aut si Ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem, qui Lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit Bigamus, baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum Catechumenum.*

absolute Necessity, when Baptism could not otherwise be had. 2. The Person baptizing must have his own Baptism entire. Which *Albaspiny* understands of not Lapsing after Baptism ^c. *Vossius* ^d with better reason supposes it to be opposed to Clinick Baptism, which was a less solemn and imperfect Baptism, which made a Man incapable of Holy Orders ever after, as I have shewn elsewhere ^e, from the ancient Laws of the Church. And it was very often attended with another Defect, which was the want of Confirmation, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost by Imposition of the Hands of the Bishop, which was not ordinarily sought for by Clinicks, who were baptiz'd in haste upon a Deathbed. For this reason these *Spanish* Bishops denied such the privilege of Baptizing in any case, whilst they allow'd it to others. 3. They require also that the Man must be no Bigamist, because that also unqualified a Person for Sacred Orders. And it was their Intent, when a Priest could not be had to administer Baptism, only to authorize such Laymen to do it, as had those proper Qualifications that were requisite to obtain Orders, and so bring them as near Priests as they could. This is the most probable account I can give at present of these Limitations: However, in the main, the Matter is indisputable, that they plainly intended, in some extraordinary Cases, to give Laymen a License and Authority to administer Baptism, which could not then be said to be unauthorized in *Spain*, since it had the best authority the Church could give it, which is the Determination and Authority of a Council. It will not
here

^c Albaspin. Not. in Locum.

^d Vossius de Baptismo Disp. 11. n. 4.

^e Origin. Eccles. Lib. 3. cap. 3. n. 12.

here be material for any one to object, That this was but the Determination of a private National Council: For we are not now enquiring, what Obligation any other Church is under to follow this Rule, but only what was matter of Fact, and the practice of the ancient Church. The Church of *Rome* varied from the Rule of this Council many Ages ago; for they allow'd Bigamists to baptize, ^f as *Auxilius* informs us, tho' that was forbidden by the Determination of this *Spanish* Council. But I proceed.

Whilst this Matter was thus determin'd in the *West*, there happen'd another famous Transaction in the *East*, which drew on a like Determination in the Church of *Alexandria*, if we may give credit to any of the ancient Historians, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Ruffin*, who all relate it. *Ruffin* says, he had the Story from the Mouth of those who liv'd and convers'd with *Athanasius*: and the Account of it, according to his Relation, is this:
 “ Alexander, Bishop of *Alexandria*, on a certain
 “ Day, being the Festival of *Peter the Martyr*, after
 “ the solemn Service of the Church was over,
 “ was entertaining himself with a prospect to-
 “ ward the Sea, whilst he expected his Clergy to
 “ come and dine with him: In his prospect, at
 “ some distance, upon the Sea-shore, he beheld
 “ a number of Youths at play, acting the part of
 “ a Bishop, and doing all things which were used
 “ to be done in the Church: and viewing them
 “ intently for some time, he at last saw them
 “ come

f Auxil. de Ordinac. Formosi ad calcem Morini de Ordinationibus, c. 10. Baptizati Bigami, si necessitas incumbit, baptizare possunt; sacrum vero ordinem Canonice accipere nequeunt.

“ come to the secret and mystical Rites of Reli-
 “ gion. Upon which being somewhat perplex’d,
 “ he sent immediately for his Clergy, and shew’d
 “ them what he himself had seen; ordering them
 “ withal to go and bring the Boys before him.
 “ Who being ask’d, what Play they were at, and
 “ what they had done, and after what manner;
 “ they at first deny’d all the whole Matter, as
 “ Children use to do through Fear, but afterward
 “ they told every thing in order as it was done,
 “ confessing that they had baptiz’d certain Cate-
 “ chumens, by the hands of *Athanasius*, who acted
 “ the Part of the Bishop in the Play. Then ex-
 “ amining farther of those who were said to be
 “ baptiz’d, & what Questions they were ask’d, and
 “ what Answers they made; and being likewise
 “ inform’d by him who had been the chief Actor,
 “ when he found that all things had been done
 “ according to the Rites of our Religion; after
 “ he had conferr’d with a Council of his Clergy,
 “ he is said to have determin’d, That the Baptism
 “ of those on whom Water had been pour’d, with
 “ the proper Interrogatories and Responses, ought
 “ not to be repeated, but only have those things
 “ added, which the Priests were used to perform.,,
Socrates^h and *Sozomen*ⁱ have the same Story, and
 the Author of the Life of *Athanasius*^k in *Photius*,
 with

g Ruffin. Hist. Lib. 1. c. 14. Tum ille diligenter inquirens
 ab his qui baptizati dicebantur, quid interrogati fuerint, quid-
 ve responderint, simul & ab eo qui interrogaverat, ubi videt
 secundum religionis nostræ ritum cuncta constare, conlocutus
 cum Concilio Clericorum, Statuisse traditur, illis, quibus inte-
 gris Interrogationibus & Responsionibus aqua fuerat infusa,
 iterari baptismum non debere, sed adimpleri ea quæ a sacer-
 dotibus mos est, &c.

h Socrat. Hist. Lib. 1. c. 15.

i Sozom. Lib. 2. c. 17.

k Phot. Cod. 258.

with *Johannes Moschus*^l, and many others. They who find themselves pressed with this Relation, take several ways to evade the Force of it. *Michael Glycas*, a Greek Historian, plainly inverts the Bishop's Determination, and says, he order'd them to be Rebaptized. Which is so manifest a Prevarication, and Affront to the Faith of all the old Historians, that it deserves no other Answer, but to give it its true Name of a bold Falsification and Imposture. Others incline to call in question the whole Story, and tell us, that Learned Men now generally also incline to reject it as a Fiction. I know *Spanheim*, and some few others do so; but the generality of Learned Men are not of that Opinion: Archbishop *Whitgift*, Abbot, *Cotelerius*, *Pagi*, and many others that might be nam'd, Men of Character in their Age, have appear'd in its behalf, and defended it as a genuine piece of History. And it is some confirmation, that *Ruffin* says, he had it from the Mouth of those who conversed with *Athanasius*. And *Nicephorus Callistus*, who also relates the Story^m, gives a parallel Instance of another Fact much like this, which happen'd in his own Time at *Constantinople*. Which shews it not to be altogether so singular and incredible a Case, as some are apt to imagine. But admit it were a fabulous Report, yet we must charitably believe of the ancient Historians, both *Greek* and *Latin*, that they believ'd themselves, at least, what they reported; that such a Fact had happen'd at *Alexandria*; and if it had been contrary to the general sense and practice of the Church in their Times, they would hardly have related it so plausibly, without passing some Censure

^l Moschus Pratum Spir. c. 197.

^m Niceph. Hist. Lib. 3. c. 37.

sure and Reflexion on it ; as some modern *Greeks* have done, who like not the thing, and therefore censure it, not as a fabulous Story, but an irregular Action : Which the ancient Historians having not done, it may reasonably be concluded, that, at least, they thought the Determination of *Alexander* and his Council to be agreeable to the general sense and practise of the Church. But there is another Exception made to this Case by *Matthew Blastares*ⁿ, a modern *Greek* Canonist, who says, It was only a single Example, and done against Canon. Which is an Answer that has more Modesty, and in one part of it seems to carry more weight in it than either of the former. For I believe there is no Canon that does antecedently authorize one Youth, without necessity, to baptize another. But then he a little mistakes the Question, which is not about the Fact of *Athanasius*, but the Determination of *Alexander* upon it : For as to the Fact of *Athanasius*, any one will readily own, that there was neither Canon nor Precedent, perhaps, to warrant the doing of it ; and it would be strange if any such Canon should be made in the Church. But for the Determination of *Alexander*, that a Baptism given in due Form, tho' irregularly, by the hand of a Layman, may be so valid as not to need repeating ; I believe it will not be so easy a Matter as *Blastares* imagin'd, to produce an ancient Canon directly to confront it, by declaring that such Irregular Baptisms are utterly null and void, tho' they have the postnate Allowance of the Church where they are done, which was the peculiar Cir-

ⁿ *Blastar*. Syntagma Canon. ap. *Bevereg*. Pandect. Tom. 2.
p. 24.

Circumstance of the present Case: For there seem to be two ways of allowing any Act, either by an antecedent Authority given to a Man to perform it, or by a subsequent Confirmation of the thing when done Irregularly, and without Authority, which is, *ex post facto*, an allowance of it. And thus, it is plain, the Baptisms given by *Athanasius* were allow'd and confirm'd by *Alexander* in the Church.

In the latter end of the IVth Century liv'd St. *Jerom* and St. *Austin*, who have both spoken very plainly of the practice of the Church, as to what concerns the allowance of Lay-Baptism in some certain Cases. St. *Jerom*, as has been observ'd before, derives the Power of Presbyters and Deacons to baptize, from the original Power of the Bishop: yet, in Cases of Necessity, he says, it was^o also allow'd frequently to Laymen: For in such Cases he that had receiv'd Baptism, might give it to others. This Testimony of St. *Jerom* is so full and plain, that I have often wonder'd how so learned and acute a Man as Dr. *Forbes* ^p, and the Ingenious Mr. *Reeves* ^q, could run into such a Mistake, as to say, "That after the Council of *Nice*, this Proposition, That those whom a Laick baptizeth are to be Rebaptized, was look'd upon to be so true, that it was the undoubted Principle, whereby the Orthodox

§. II.
Of St. Jerom.

D

"con-

^o Hieron. Dial. c. Lucif. c. 4. Sine Chrismate & Jussione Episcopi neque Presbyter neque Diaconus jus habent baptizandi. Quod frequenter (si tamen necessitas cogit) scimus etiam licere Laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita & dare potest.

^p Forbes Instruct. Hist. Lib. 10. cap. 14. n. 5.

^q Reeves Note on Vincent, Lirin. p. 263.

“ confuted the Luciferians. „ Who, that reads these words in these Learned Writers, and looks no farther, would not at first sight be tempted to think, that the Council of *Nice* had somewhere made an Order, that Persons baptized by Laymen should be rebaptized ; and that the Catholics generally made use of this as an undoubted Principle to confute the Luciferians ? And yet in Fact there was no such thing. The Council of *Nice* never made any Decree about the Rebaptization of Persons baptiz’d by Laymen, but only by Heretical Priests. Nor did the Catholics use that Proposition as an undoubted Principle against the Luciferians. *St. Jerom* wrote against the Luciferians, but he is so far from asserting, universally, that those whom a Laick baptizeth are to be rebaptized, that he expressly maintains the contrary, That if necessity requir’d, Laymen had liberty granted them to baptize. *Mr. Reeves* has once done me the Honour to let my Opinion and Judgment be of some Esteem with him, and I believe when he considers this Matter again, he will see reason to alter his Opinion in this particular, being as Ingenuous as he is Learned ; and the rather, because the World is apt to be led into Error by Persons of Note and Authority, and to take things upon Trust, when deliver’d to them by Men of a superior Character. If there had not been this fear, I could not have prevail’d with myself to have noted this Mistake in a Person, for whose useful Labours I have so great a Veneration.

§. 12.
Of *St. Austin*.

St. Austin was Cotemporary with *St. Jerom*, and of the same Opinion with him in this Matter. In his Epistle to *Fortunatus*, which is preserved

served in *Gratian*^r, he says, “ In time of Necessity, when a Bishop, or a Presbyter, or other Minister could not be found, and a Man desired Baptism who was in danger of Death, in that Case Laymen were used to give him that Sacrament which they had receiv’d, rather than he should end his Life without it. „ And this Custom he founds upon Authority descended by Bishops from the Apostles: For in the same Epistle^f he says, “ Baptism is Holy in itself, if it be given in the Name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost: And there is in this Sacrament the Authority of the Commission which our Saviour gave to the Apostles, and by them to Bishops, and other Priests, and even to Laymen descending from the same Stock and Original. „ He there also relates a Story of a certain Catechumen, who being at Sea, and in danger of being cast away in a Storm, was baptiz’d by a Penitent, because there was no other Christian in the Ship with them. And he concludes upon it, that tho’ such a Fact had not happen’d, yet it was a Case that, every one must own, might happen;

D 2

and

^r Ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. Dist. 4. c. 21. In necessitate, cum Episcopi aut Presbyteri aut quilibet Ministrorum non inveniuntur, & urget periculum ejus qui petit, ne sine isto Sacramento hanc vitam finiat, etiam Laicos solere dare Sacramentum, quod acceperunt, solemus audire.

^f Ibid. ap. Gratian. c. 36. Sanctum est Baptisma per seipsum, quod datum est in nomine Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti: Ita ut in eodem Sacramento sit etiam Auctoritas Traditionis per Dominum nostrum ad Apostolos, per illos autem ad Episcopos, & alios sacerdotes, vel etiam Laicos Christianos ab eadem Origine & stirpe venientes.

Ibid. Non potest quisquam dicere relinquendum esse illum, qui morte imminente baptizari desiderat. Quem baptizatum a Poenitente quisquis non credat contigisse, oportet ut credat posse contingere.

and then no one could say, that in such a Case a Man who desired Baptism in imminent danger of Death, was to be deserted and left unbaptized. But if any one thinks these Passages doubtful, because they are only related by *Gratian*, he may read the same in *St. Austin's* undoubted Works. In his Books against *Parmenian* the Donatist ^t he uses this Argument to prove that the Baptism of Hereticks ought not to be repeated: "Because tho' it be but
 " a Layman that gives Baptism to a Man in ex-
 " tremam Necessity, when he is ready to perish, he
 " cannot think any one can piously say, that it
 " ought to be repeated. If it be done without
 " Necessity, it is indeed an usurpation of ano-
 " ther Man's Office: but if he be compel'd by
 " Necessity, it is either no Fault at all, or but a
 " very light one.,"

S. 13.
 Of *Gelasius*.
 an. 492.

The next Writer after *St. Austin*, who has said any thing of this Matter, is *Gelasius* Bishop of *Rome*, who, in his Epistle to the Bishops of *Lucania*, *Brutia*, and *Sicily* ^u restrains the Office of Baptizing in Ordinary Cases to Bishops and Presbyters only; excluding Deacons from it, except in Cases of extreme Necessity, when the supe-

^t Aug. cont. Epist. Parmen. Lib. 2. c. 13. Et si Laicus aliquis pereunti dederit, necessitate compulsus, quod cum ipse acciperet, dandum esse addidit, nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repetendum. Nulla enim necessitate si fiat, alieni muneris usurpatio est: si autem Necessitas urgeat, aut nullum, aut veniale delictum est.

^u Gelas. Ep. 9. ad Episcop. Lucan. c. 9. Absque Episcopo vel Presbytero, baptizare non præsumat Diaconus; nisi prædictis fortasse Officiis longius constitutis, necessitas extrema compellat: Quod & Laicis Christianis facere plerumque conceditur.

superior Ministers were absent: In which Cases it was often allow'd to Lay-Christians to perform it. So that Laymen had as much Authority to perform it, in the absence of Deacons, as Deacons had to do it in the absence of the Presbyters and Bishop.

Isidore, Bishop of Sevil, lived about an hundred Years after Gelasius, and he delivers himself to the same effect: ' That it is unlawful either ' for private Men, or the inferior Clergy^w to baptize; for the Office belongs only to Priests. ' We read in the Gospel, that it was given by ' Commission to no other but the Apostles, Jesus, ' after his Resurrection, saying unto them, As my ' Father hath sent me, so send I you. And when he ' had said this, he breathed on them, saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever Sins ye remit, ' they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye ' retain, they are retained. And in another place, ' Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of ' the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. ' Whence it is manifest, That the Ministry of ' Baptism was committed only to Priests; nor is it

§. 14.
Of Isidore, Bishop of Sevil, an. 595.

D 3

lawful

^w Isidor. de Offic. Eccles. Lib. 2. c. 24. Quod nec Privatis, nec Clericis sine gradu, baptizare liceat, nisi tantum sacerdotibus: In Evangelio legimus, Apostolis tantum permissum, Jesu post resurrectionem dicente, sicut misit me Pater, & ego mitto vos. Et hoc cum dixisset, insufflavit & ait eis, Accipite Spiritum Sanctum. Quorum remiseritis peccata, remittentur eis; & quorum retinueritis, retenta erunt. Et in alio loco, Ite, docete omnes Gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti. Unde constat baptisma solis Sacerdotibus esse traditum; ejusque mysterium nec ipsis Diaconibus explere est licitum absque Episcopis vel Presbyteris: nisi, illis absentibus, ultima languoris cogat necessitas: Quod & Laicis Fidelibus plerumque permittitur; ne quisquam sine remedio salutari de seculo evocetur.

lawful for Deacons themselves to perform the Mystery without a Bishop or a Presbyter: Except in their absence the extreme necessity of Sickness compel them to do it: In which case also Lay-Christians are often permitted to do it; lest any one should be called out of the World without the Remedy or Means of Salvation. Thus we have seen for Six-hundred Years the general sense and practice of the ancient Church, grounded, as they suppose, upon the Commission given to the Apostles; whereby Bishops, as the Apostles Successors, are qualified first to give Baptism themselves, and then to grant a Commission to others to baptize; and that either to Presbyters and Deacons, or to Presbyters alone in Ordinary Cases; and in Cases Extraordinary and of extreme Necessity, to Deacons and Laymen.

§. 15.

The Objection from St. Chrysostom, Basil, and Cyprian answered.

To this general consent of Antiquity, Dr. Forbes^x and some others who follow him, have oppos'd the Testimony of St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and St. Cyprian; whose Evidence, if it were entirely on the Objectors side, would not weigh very much, because it would be only their Private Sense, and not the Practice of the Church, which is the Subject of the present Enquiry. But I have shew'd before, Sect. 5. that St. Chrysostom's Meaning is utterly mistaken by Dr. Forbes. For when Chrysostom confines the Office of Baptism to the hands of a Priest, he only means in Ordinary Cases; otherwise Deacons, who are no Priests, would be absolutely excluded from it in all Cases whatsoever, as well as Laymen: And yet Chrysostom allows Dea-

^x Forbes Instruct. Hist. Theol. Lib. 10. cap. 14.

Deacons to baptize in Cases of Necessity ; which makes it evident, that his Discourse only relates to the ministration of Baptism in Ordinary Cases. I do not here repeat St. *Chrysostom's* words, because the Reader may find them alledg'd above, in speaking of the Power of Deacons. As to St. *Basil*, it will be readily own'd, that he had somewhat of a singular Opinion in this Matter : For he was for rebaptizing all Persons that were only baptized by Laymen, as he was also for rebaptizing all that were baptized by Heretical and Schismatical Priests ; for he brings in *Cyprian*, and *Firmilian* his Predecessor in the See of *Cæsarea*, arguing after this manner ; ‘ Hereticks and Schismatics y are
 ‘ broken off from the Church, and become Lay-
 ‘ men, and therefore have no Power to Baptize,
 ‘ or to Ordain, being no longer able to give the
 ‘ Gift of the Holy Ghost to others, which they
 ‘ have lost themselves. Therefore such as are
 ‘ baptized by them, when they return to the
 ‘ Church, are to be rebaptized with the true
 ‘ Baptism of the Church, as being only baptized
 ‘ by Laymen. , If it were not for St. *Basil's* Testimony, I should doubt whether *Cyprian* had ever made use of such an Argument as this. 1. Because no such Argument, that I know of, is to be found in his Works. 2. Because *Tertullian*, whom *Cyprian* commonly call'd his Master, made a great Distinction between the Baptism of Hereticks and the Baptism of Catholick Laymen, at least in

D 4

Cases

y *Basil*. Ep. 1. ad *Amphiloch*. cap. 1. ‘Οι δὲ ἀπορράγντες, λαϊκοὶ γινόμενοι, ὅτε τὸ βαπτίζειν, ὅτε τὸ χειροτονεῖν εἶχον ἐξουσίαν, ἐκέπθον δυνάμενοι χάριν πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐτέροις παρέχειν, ἧς αὐτοὶ ἐκπεπτώκασι. Διὸ ὡς καὶ λαϊκῶν βαπτιζομένους τὸν παρ’ αὐτῶν, ἐκέλευσαν ἐρχομένους εἶπαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῷ ἀληθινῷ βαπτίσματι, τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀνακαταίρεσθαι.

Cases of Necessity, as we have seen before. For he was against rebaptizing those that were so baptized by Laymen, tho' he was as much for rebaptizing those that were baptiz'd by Hereticks^z, as *Cyprian* himself. 3. *Cyprian* always paid a far greater Deference to Catholick Laymen than he did to Heretical Priests; as esteeming the one Members of the Church, and the other quite cut off from it: He admitted the one into his Councils, and did nothing without their Consent in many Ecclesiastical Causes: But the other he abandoned and abhorred, as Men that had abandoned the Faith, and renounced their Christianity by their Heretical Doctrine. These are probable Arguments to incline a Man to think, that *Cyprian* was of the same Mind with his Master *Tertullian*, as to the Point of Lay-baptism, had not *St. Basil's* Authority been against them. But however this Matter was, *St. Basil* was not so stiff to this Opinion, and the particular Practice of his own Church, as to unchristian those that were baptiz'd by Schismatics, or break the Communion of the Church upon it: For he gives his Advice in the words immediately following, That Men should
 ' quietly comply with the Rules and Practice of their
 ' own Church where they liv'd. But forasmuch,
 says he, ' as some of the Asiatick Churches^a think
 ' otherwise, that the Baptism of such, by way of
 ' Dispensation for the sake of great Multitudes,
 ' ought to be received, let it be received.
 Whence, I think, it may be inferr'd, that tho'
St. Basil, in his own Opinion, did not approve of
 the

^z See *Tertul. de Baptismo*, c. 15.

^a *Basil. Ep. Canon. i. can. i.* Ἐπειδὴν δὲ ὅλως ἔδοξε ποιῆσαι κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, οἰκονομίας ἕνεκα τῶν πολλῶν, δεχθῆναι αὐτῶν τὸ βάπτισμα, ἕως δεκτὸν.

the Baptism either of Schismatics or Laymen, yet he thought it might stand good, if the Church thought fit to receive and confirm it: And this he seems to assert, upon the common Principle of the Ancients, that a Latitude of Power was left with the Rulers and Governours of the Church, to ratify such Baptisms, when they found it necessary for the Benefit and Edification of the Church. But, if otherwise, St. Basil's Opinion, or St. Cyprian's, cannot prejudice the contrary Doctrin, or be thrown into the Ballance against the common Consent and Practice of the Church. And yet it may be observ'd, That St. Basil speaks, perhaps, not of Lay-baptism in Cases of Necessity, but of usurping the Office, as Hereticks did in Ordinary Cases: Which makes a wide difference in the Case, and belongs to a more difficult Question, that is, Whether unauthorized Baptisms were ever ratified and made good by the subsequent Confirmation and Reception of the Church? Which is the next Point that comes now in order to be considered.

This Question, as I said, has much more difficulty than the former: Because a great many of the Authors who have justified the Lawfulness of Lay-baptism in Cases of Necessity, are wholly silent upon this Point: For neither Tertullian, nor the Council of Eliberis, nor St. Jerom, nor Gelasius, nor Isidore, have said any thing upon it; they only consider the Case of Necessity and no other. And the Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* seems to pronounce severely of usurped and unauthorized Actions, as utterly null and void. He has a whole Chapter with this Title, 'That it is an horrible thing for a Man to thrust himself

§. 16.

Whether the usurped and unauthorized Baptism of Laymen was allowed to be valid.

' himself into the Priests Dignity or Office, as
 ' the *Corabites*, and *Saul*, and *Uzzias* did: And he
 thus expresses himself upon it; ' As it was not
 ' lawful for a Stranger, that was not of the Tribe
 ' of *Levi*, to offer any thing, or approach the Al-
 ' tar without a Priest; so do ye nothing without
 ' the Bishop. For if any Man does any thing
 ' without the Bishop, he does it ^b in vain: It shall
 ' not be reputed to him as any Service. As *Saul*,
 ' when he had offered Sacrifice without *Samuel*,
 ' was told, that he had done vainly; so whatever
 ' Layman does any thing without a Priest, he la-
 ' bours in vain. And as King *Uzzias*, when he
 ' had invaded the Priest's Office, was smitten with
 ' Leprosy for his Transgression; so every Layman
 ' shall bear his Punishment, that contemns GOD,
 ' and insults his Priests, and takes Honour to him-
 ' self, not imitating CHRIST, who glorified not
 ' himself, but stayed till his Father said, *Thou art*
 ' *a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchizedek.*
 Now this Discourse, when applied to Baptism,
 will amount to this, That every one who usurps
 the Office of Baptizing, which belongs not to
 him, is a great Transgressor in the sight of GOD;
 and all his Acts are vain, as to what concerns him-
 self; for they shall never be accounted to him as
 acceptable Service, worthy of a Reward, but ra-
 ther inevitably make him liable to Wrath and Pu-
 nishment. But still the Question remains, Whe-
 ther such Acts, tho' vain in respect of the Admi-
 nistrator, be utterly vain and void in respect of
 the

^b Constit. Apost. Lib. 2: c. 27. 'Εἰ δὲ τις ἄνευ τῆς ἐπισκόπου
 ποιῇ τι, εἰς μάτην ποιῇ αὐτό. 'Ου γὰρ αὐτῷ εἰς ἔργον λογιθήσε-
 ται. ὡς γὰρ ὁ Σαὺλ ἄνευ τῆς Σαμουὴλ προσενέγκας, ἤκουσεν, ὅτι
 ματαιώσεται σοι ἔργον καὶ πᾶς λαϊκὸς ἄνευ τῆς ἱερέως ἐπιτελῶν τι,
 μάταια ποιεῖ.

the Receiver also? And as this Author has not precisely determin'd this Point, so I will not pretend to determine it from him. On the other hand, the Determination that was given by *Alexander* and the Church of *Alexandria*, is plain, that such Baptisms, tho' unauthoriz'd and very irregular in the Administrator, are not wholly null and void as to the effect in the Party Baptiz'd. *Athanasius*, it is certain, could have no Law of the Church to authorize him to baptize in that Case and Manner in which he perform'd it; and yet *Alexander* would not suffer those to be rebaptized, who had been so baptized by him. *St. Austin* was of the same Judgment: He freely owns, that when Baptism is perform'd by a Layman, without Necessity, it is an usurpation of another Man's Office: But yet he thinks it is not wholly null and void as to the Receiver, but a true Baptism, which ought not to be repeated: His words are these; 'Though it be usurped without c Necessity, and given by any Man to another, that which is given cannot be said not to be given, though it may be truly said to be unlawfully given. Therefore the unlawful usurpation is to be corrected by a sincere and affectionate Repentance.'

c Aug. cont. Epist. Parmen. Lib. 2. c. 13. Sed etsi nulla necessitate usurpetur, & à quolibet cuilibet detur; quod datum fuerit, non potest dici non datum, quamvis recte dici potest illicite datum. Illicitam ergo Usurpationem corrigit remanentis & pœnitentis affectus. Quod si non correxerit, manebit ad pœnam usurpatoris, quod datum est, vel ejus qui illicite dedit, vel ejus qui illicite accepit: non tamen pro non dato habetur. Neque ullo modo per devotum militem, quod à privatis usurpatum est, signum Regale violabitur. Si enim aliqui furtim & Extraordinarie, non in monetis publicis aurum vel argentum, sed æs percutiendo signaverint; cum fuerit deprehensum, nonne illis punitis aut indulgentia liberatis, cognitum regale signum Thesauris regalibus cogetur inferri?

' penance. And if it be not corrected, that which
 ' is given will remain to the Punishment of the
 ' Usurper, as well of him who gave it unlawfully,
 ' as of him who receiv'd it unlawfully : but yet it
 ' cannot be accounted as not given. No devout
 ' Soldier ever violates the Royal Stamp, tho' it be
 ' usurped by private Men : For tho' some by
 ' stealth, and in a clandestine way, set the Royal
 ' Stamp, not to the publick Money, but their own;
 ' yet the Money so stamp'd, when they are either
 ' punish'd or pardon'd for their Offence, having
 ' the Royal Standard upon it, is not defac'd, but
 ' brought into the King's Treasury. , Whence it
 is plain, he thought that Baptism given by Lay-
 men in Ordinary Cases, which was an usurpation
 of the Priest's Office, was not to be repeated.
 And this he asserts in another place against the
 Donatists ; yet not as the Determination of any
 General Council, but as his own Opinion : For
 he says, if he were a Member of such a Synod,
 wherein this Question was debated, he should not
 scruple to assert all those to have Baptism^d, where-
 soever, or by whomsoever baptiz'd, that had re-
 ceiv'd it in Faith, and without Dissimulation, in
 that Form of words which is prescrib'd by the
 Gospel : tho' if they wanted Charity, and were
 out of the Catholick Church, it would not profit
 them to Salvation, or any other spiritual Con-
 cerns. *Optatus* was plainly of the same Opinion,
 He thought that CHRIST gave a Commission to
 his Apostles to baptize, but yet not such an one
 as

d Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 7. c. 53. Nequaquam dubitarem habere
 eos baptismum, qui ubicunque, & à quibuscunque illud verbis
 Evangelicis consecratum, sine sua Simulatione, & cum aliqua
 fide accepissent: Quanquam eis ad salutem spiritualem non pro-
 desset, si caritate caruissent, qua Catholicæ infererentur Ecclesiæ.

as peremptorily annulled and evacuated all Baptisms that were performed by any other. Our Saviour, says he, gave Commandment ^e in whose Name the Nations should be baptized: But he did not determine without Exception, by whom they should be baptized. He said not to his Disciples, This shall ye do, and no other shall do it. For whoever baptizes in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, fulfils the Work of the Apostles. Then he alledges that saying of Saint John the Apostle in the Gospel, *Master we saw one casting out Devils in thy Name, and we forbid him, because he followeth not with us.* To which CHRIST replied, *Forbid him not, for he that is not against you is for you.* Upon which he concludes, that it was the Name of the Trinity, and not the Work of the Agent that sanctifies the Mystery, and that the Ministers of Baptism were only Labourers, and not Lords of the Action. And upon this Ground he allows the Baptism of Schismatics, and such Hereticks also as baptiz'd in the Faith of the Trinity, to be valid, tho' they were not every way legally authoriz'd and qualify'd, as the true Ministers of the Church, to perform it: Of which more hereafter in its proper place.

The next Question is concerning the Baptism of Women, Whether they had any Authority, or were ever allow'd in any Case to baptize in the

§. 17.
Of the Baptism of Women, whether they had any Authority to baptize.

Church?

^e Optat. cont. Parmen. Lib. 5. p. 90. In quo baptizarentur gentes, à salvatore mandatum est: per quem baptizentur, nulla exceptione discretum est. Non dixit Apostolis, Vos facite, alii non faciant. Quisquis in nomine Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti baptizaverit, Apostolorum opus implevit. ----- Ergo nomen est quod sanctificat, non opus.

Church? As to Ordinary Cases, it is agreed on all hands, that they were absolutely forbidden to meddle with any Ecclesiastical Office, and Baptism in particular. This was the Controversy between the Church, and several ancient Heresies, whether Women might be Priests, and Baptize as well as Men. The *Marcionites* affirm'd it to be lawful; so did the *Collyridians*, and the *Pepuzians*, and *Cataphrygians*, which were a Branch of the *Montanists*. But the Catholics with great vehemence always oppos'd this, as an Illegal and Unchristian Practice, as I have had occasion to shew more at large in another Work, where I discourse of the Office of the Deaconesses^f in the ancient Church, to which I refer the Reader. The *Lutherans* and the *Romanists*, who defend the Baptism of Women in Cases of extreme Necessity, do not deny this, but say their Adversaries do them wrong to charge them with the Practice of the *Marcionites* and *Montanists*, which they utterly disavow. Therefore the stress of the Question lies in this, Whether the ancient Church allow'd Women to baptize in Extraordinary Cases of extreme Necessity, as she did Laymen? And here, I think, with submission to better Judgments, she did not: For *Tertullian*, in the very same place where he grants it may lawfully be done by Men, forbids it absolutely to be done by Women; and he goes upon this Principle, that Men were called to the Sacerdotal Office, but not Women; and therefore when any Exigency required, the one might perform it, but not the other. He calls it *Petulance*

^f Origin. Eccles. Lib. 2. c. 22. n. 7.

lancy & in Women to usurp the Power of Baptizing. And whereas some defended it by the Example of *Tecla*, and urg'd the Authority of that ancient Writing, which was called the Acts of *Paul* and *Tecla*, and was supposed to be written by the Apostle himself: He gives them to understand that it was no such thing, but that it was written by a Presbyter in *Asia* under the Name of *St. Paul*; and that the Presbyter was convict of the Matter, and confess'd the thing, that he did it out of Love to *St. Paul*; but he was Deposed notwithstanding for his Forgery. For it was utterly improbable, that the Apostle should grant Women a Power to Teach and Baptize, who did not so much as allow them to ask Questions for Learning's sake in a publick Assembly. In another place ^h he says, It was not permitted to Women to speak in the Church: 'But neither might they Teach, nor 'Baptize, nor offer the Oblation, nor assume to 'themselves any Office belonging to Men, much 'less those that appertain'd to the Priests only., Whence it seems pretty plain, that he did not allow the same Power and Authority to Women to

g Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. Petulantia autem mulierum, quæ usurpavit docere, utique non etiam tingendi jus sibi pariet; nisi si quæ nova bestia evenerit similis pristinæ; ut quemadmodum illa baptismum aufererat, ita aliqua per se eum conferat. Quod si quæ Pauli perperam scripta legunt, exemplum *Teclæ* ad licentiam mulierum docendi, tingendique, defendunt: Sciant in *Asia* Presbyterum, qui eam Scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum, id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco decessisse. Quàm enim fidei proximum videretur, ut is docendi & tinguendi daret foeminæ potestatem, qui ne discere quidem constanter mulieri permisit?

h Tertul. de Veland. Virg. c. 9. Non permittitur mulieri in Ecclesia loqui: Sed nec docere, nec tingere, nec offerre, nec ullius virilis Muneris, nedum sacerdotalis Officii sortem sibi vindicare.

to baptize in Cases of Necessity, as he did to Men, since he makes an Exception in the one Case, but none in the other. And so in the IVth Council of *Carthage*ⁱ Women are absolutely forbidden to baptize, without any Exception. For tho' *Gratian* and *Peter Lombard* add the words, *Nisi necessitate cogente*, except Necessity require, to the ancient Body of that Canon; yet this is either an Interpretation of their own, or else a plain Fraud; for there is no such Reading now in any Tome of the Councils; and as *Vossius*^k observes, it is otherwise cited by *Walfridus Strabo*^l some Ages before them; which is an Argument, that the former is the genuine Reading, and that the Canon originally had no such Exception. Nor does St. *Jerom*, nor St. *Austin*, nor *Gelasius*, nor *Isidore*, grant any Authority to Women to baptize, as they do to Men. Whence it may be inferr'd from their Silence, that they did not think their Cases to be parallel. And it may be concluded farther, that the Practice and Rules of the modern *Greek Church*, and *Romanists*, and *Lutherans*, which allow Midwives, or any other Women to baptize in Cases of Necessity, whatever other Grounds they may have to go upon, are not to be justified from the Rules and Canons of the ancient Church, since there are no such to authorize the Practice.

§. 18.

Whether the usurped Baptism of Women was esteemed valid.

But it will be demanded farther, Whether if Women usurped the Authority of Baptizing, either in Ordinary Cases, as the Heretical Priestesses did; or in Extraordinary Cases of Necessity, as perhaps some might

ⁱ Conc. Carth. 4. can. 100. Mulier baptizare non præsumat.

^k Voss. de Bapt. Disp. 11. n. 15. p. 148.

^l Strabo de Offic. cap. 26.

might do in the Catholick Church, tho' against Law; was their Baptism repeated as null and void, or received as valid by the Church? This Question consisting of several Parts, I cannot give the same distinct and positive Answer to each part of it. But I think there is no doubt to be made, but that, *first*, All such Churches as rejected the Baptism of Heretical Men, must needs be supposed to have rejected the Baptism of Heretical Women, whether in Ordinary or Extraordinary Cases. Therefore *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, and *Firmilian*^m are plain in the Case, that all such Baptisms are invalid. I think it also probable, that they who receiv'd the Baptism of Heretical Men out of the Church as valid; and the Baptism of Catholick Laymen in the Church, as not only valid, but authoriz'd too, did yet reject the Baptism of Women in both Cases, because they are so peremptory in prohibiting Women universally to meddle with the ministerial Offices, and this always without Exception of any Cases whatsoever. But as I remember no ancient Author that has spoken directly and closely to this part of the Question; and there are some Reasons to incline a Man to believe St. *Austin* to have been of a different Opinion; so I leave this to the Judgment of others, and farther Enquiry.

The next thing in debate is, concerning Baptism administred by Heretical and Schismatical Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and such of the Catholick Clergy as are legally Degraded or Deposed by the Authority of the

§. 19.

Whether Heretical and Schismatical Priests, and Degraded Clergymen had any legal authority to baptize.

E

Church,

^m Firmil. Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 223.

Church, for transgressing the Rules of their Function. The particular Stating and Examination of this Matter is a thing of great Weight and Moment ; because it is such a Practical Case as the Church has always been much more concern'd in, than in that of the Baptism of meer Laymen : And the whole Church of *England*, and all the Churches of the Reformation have the very Essence and Being of their Baptism and Christianity depending on it. For they all receiv'd their Baptism from the Heretical and Schismatical Church of *Rome* : According therefore as Heretical and Schismatical Baptism is determin'd to be valid or not valid, such must be the Fate of these Churches, either to have receiv'd true and valid Baptism, or else to want yet all of them to be Rebaptized. Now that I may speak the sense of the ancient Church upon this grand Point with Clearness and Distinction, it will be necessary to treat separately of these Four Questions : 1. Whether Hereticks and Schismatics have any Legal Authority from the Church to Baptize ? 2. Whether supposing them to have no Legal Authority, their Baptism be notwithstanding true and valid Baptism ? 3. What Privileges are conferr'd by such Baptism, what are its Defects, and how those Deficiencies were supply'd upon Mens returning to the Unity of the Holy Catholick Church ? 4. Whether Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clergymen act in that Capacity as Clergymen or Laymen ? The distinct Consideration of these several Questions will be of great use : For nothing has more embroil'd the Church, or confounded Men in this Dispute, than the not distinguishing authorized Baptism from that which is meerly valid ; and the Privileges and Perfections of the one from the Deficiencies and Imperfections of the other.

other. It was the not attending to these things distinctly, that led *Cyprian* and all his Associates into the Error of Rebaptization: They thought no Baptism could be valid, unless both the Administrator was an authoriz'd Person, and his Baptism could also exhibit all those spiritual Graces, which are ordinarily the effects of Catholick Baptism; but both these things were wanting in the Baptism of Hereticks, *viz.* both Authority and Spiritual Graces; and therefore they concluded their Baptism to be invalid. It is the same want of attending to the Distinction between Unauthoriz'd Baptism and Invalid Baptism, which leads many into a Mistake at this Day. They always confound these two things together, which yet are of very different consideration from each other: For all the Baptisms of Hereticks, Schismatics, and Degraded Ministers are unauthoriz'd; and yet it will not be safe to conclude immediately that they are therefore absolutely Invalid: Otherwise the Catholick Church and the Church of *England* were in an ill Case, as will appear by the sequel of this Discourse.

For, first of all, it was agreed on all hands, that Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clergymen had not any Legal Authority from the Church to baptize. This was not only asserted by *Cyprian* and his Followers, who maintain'd the Invalidity of such Baptisms, but also by *St. Austin*, and all the rest that stood up for the validity of them against the necessity of Rebaptizing. And they went upon this Ground, That they who deserted and opposed the Church, were thenceforth destitute of her Lawful Call, and therefore acted not only without her Authority, but against her Authority in all their Ministrations. They were so far from having the Church's Authority to

E 2

baptize

baptize in such Cases, that they incurr'd her severest Censures and Anathema's for doing it, although their Baptisms were receiv'd as valid under such an Irregular and Unlawful Administration. Nothing can be plainer than that Canon of the Second Council of *Carthage* to this purpose, which says, 'That if a Presbyter, who is under the Censure or Excommunication of his own Bishop, would have any Redress, he must apply himself to the neighbouring Bishops, and have his Cause heard by them, in order to be reconcil'd to his Bishop. But if he refuses to do this, and proudly withdrawing himself from the Communionⁿ of his Bishop, he sets up a separate and Schismatical Meeting to offer Sacrifice to God, let him be Anathema and lose his Place.,, If such a Schismatical Presbyter makes himself an Anathema for ministring the Sacrament in a separate Meeting, however valid in themselves his Sacraments may be, yet certainly he acts against the Authority of the Church, and all his Ministrations are sinful and unlawful in such a Separation. This is what we have heard *Ignatius*^o declare before, 'That it is not lawful either to baptize or celebrate the Eucharist without the Bishop, but what he allows is well-pleasing to God.,, Now what should make it sinful and displeasing to God, for a Presbyter to baptize

n Conc. Carthag. 2. Can. 8. Si quis Presbyter à Præposito suo excommunicatus vel correptus fuerit, debet utique apud vicinos Episcopos conqueri, ut ab ipsis ejus Causa possit audiri, ac per ipsos suo Episcopo reconciliari. Quod nisi fecerit, sed superbia, quod absit, inflatus, secernendum se ab Episcopi sui Communione duxerit, ac separatim cum aliquibus schisma faciens, sacrificium Deo obtulerit, Anathema habeatur ac locum amittat.

o Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. Cited before Sect. 3.

baptize without his Bishop, but only that in so doing he acts without and against the Authority of his Bishop, and in opposition to him whom God has made the chief Governour of the Church? This is also what we have heard St. *Jerom* p say before, That neither Presbyters nor Deacons have any Right to baptize without the Order or Authority of their Bishop, because he is the Chief Minister of the Church. But enough has been said already upon this Point, in speaking of the Bishops original Power, and of the Power of Presbyters and Deacons, as only Derivative from them, to shew that none can have any Lawful Authority or Regular Power to baptize, but only as they act in subordination to them, according to the standing Laws and Rules of the Catholick Church. Only here we must observe a Distinction which St. *Austin* makes about the word Power; which either signifies that Regular Authority and Power of administering Baptism in a Lawful way, which we have been speaking of; or else such a Power as may be in Men to give a Baptism that shall stand valid and firm, tho' they were not Regularly qualify'd to perform it, but did it by contradiction to known Rules, and in manifest usurpation. In which sense he allows Hereticks, and Schismatics, and contumacious or degraded Bishops and Priests to have still a Power to baptize: But then this was not the true Regular, Authoriz'd Baptism of the Church, but an Usurped Power, and Invasion of an Office which Regularly belonged to others. So that there was no Dispute among the Ancients upon this Point; for they all agreed in this, That taking Power only for Regular Power, and

E 3

Just

Just and Lawful Authority, Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Priests had not Lawful Authority to baptize; but what they did was done (properly speaking) by an Unauthoriz'd, Criminal, Anti-episcopal Usurpation, because contrary to the known Rules and Orders of the true Governing Part of the Catholick Church.

§. 20.

Whether the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics was valid.

But now, notwithstanding their Agreement upon this Point, That the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics was Unauthoriz'd and Unlawful, they were divided upon the next Question, about the Validity of such Baptisms. *Tertullian*, tho' he allowed the Lawfulness and Validity of the Baptism of Laymen in Cases of Necessity, yet he utterly rejected the Baptism of Hereticks, simply and universally, as altogether null and void: For he says, 'There is but one Baptism deliver'd to us either in the Gospel of CHRIST, or the Writings of the Apostles; because there is but one Lord, and one Baptism, and one Church in Heaven. Upon which account it is proper to consider, what is to be observ'd in relation to Hereticks.

q Tertul. de Bapt. c. 15. Unus omnino baptismus est nobis, tam ex Domini Evangelio, quam ex Apostoli literis: Quoniam unus Dominus, & unum baptisma, & una Ecclesia in cœlis. Sed circa hæreticos sane quid custodiendum sit, digne quis retractet. Ad nos enim editum est. Hæretici autem nullum habent consortium nostræ Disciplinæ; quos Extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademptio Communicationis. Non debeo in illis cognoscere, quod mihi est præceptum; quia non idem Deus est nobis & illis; nec unus Christus, id est, idem: Ideoque nec baptismus unus, quia non idem: quem cum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent: Nec capit numerari, quod non habetur: Ita nec possunt accipere, quia non habent. Sed de isto plenius jam nobis in Græco digestum est.

' ticks. For the thing is only given in Command
 ' to us. But Hereticks have no Part or Fellowship
 ' in our Discipline; their very breach of Commu-
 ' nion testifies them to be Foreigners: Therefore I
 ' ought not to acknowledge that in them, which is
 ' only commanded to me; because we and they
 ' have not the same God, nor the same CHRIST;
 ' and consequently not one and the same Baptism;
 ' which seeing they have not Rightfully, they have
 ' it not at all. That which is not, cannot come in-
 ' to any account; nor can they be said to receive
 ' that which they have not. , He says also he wrote
 a Book in *Greek* particularly to this purpose. And
 he touches upon it in his Book of Prescriptions
 against Hereticks ^r, where he says, ' No Man can
 ' be Edified by him, by whom he is Destroyed. No
 ' Man can be illuminated by him, of whom he is
 ' led into Darknes. , And in another Book he
 tells us ^f more expresly, That Hereticks were
 received again by Baptism, in the same manner
 as Heathens were. Some think *Tertullian* here
 speaks of the School of *Montanus*, because he wrote
 his Book *de Pudicitia* when he was a Montanist:
 but his other Books were written by him whilst
 he was a Catholick; and therefore I rather think
 he spake the sense of the Church of *Carthage*, and
 perhaps the whole *African* Church in those Days.
 For *Agrippinus*, Bishop of *Carthage*, with a Synod
 of the Provinces of *Africa* and *Numidia* not long
 after confirm'd the same thing, as we learn from

E 4

Cypri-

^r Tertul. de Præscrip. c. 12. Nemo inde strui potest, unde
 destruitur. Nemo ab eo illuminatur, a quo contenebratur.

^f Id. de Pudicit. c. 19. Apud nos ut Ethnico par, immo &
 super Ethnicum Hæreticus etiam per baptismum veritatis utroque
 homine purgatus admittitur.

Cyprian's ^t Epistles : And the Opinion of *Cyprian* ^u, and the several Councils of *Carthage* in his Time ^w are so well known, that I need not insist upon them. *Firmilian* also, Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, joined with *Cyprian*, and wrote a long Epistle to him ^x in defence of the same Opinion, where he also mentions the Decree of the Synod of *Iconium* to the same purpose. *Dionysius* also, Bishop of *Alexandria*, maintain'd the same Doctrine ^y, and in one of his Epistles he alledges the Decrees of the Councils of *Iconium* and *Synada* for confirmation of it. On the other hand, *Stephen*, Bishop of *Rome*, and the Churches under him, stood up in defence of the contrary Opinion : They asserted, That all who were Baptized in the Name of the Holy Trinity, were to be receiv'd only with Imposition of Hands, without Rebaptizing, whatever Heresies or Schisms they came over from to the Catholick Church : For so *Firmilian*, in his Epistle to *Cyprian* ^z, delivers their Opinion with exactness and candor. I know indeed a great many Learned Persons, and among them *Vossius*, *Blondel*, and Bishop *Pearson* ^a are of Opinion; That *Stephen*, Bishop of *Rome*, in Opposition to *Cyprian's* Doctrine, fell inconsiderately into the contrary extreme, and asserted, That all Persons baptized by Hereticks, whether in the Name

^t Cypr. Ep. 71. ad Quint. p. 196. Ep. 73. ad Jubaianum. p. 199.

^u Cypr. Ep. 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, &c.

^w Conc. Carthag. ap. Cypr. p. 229. It. Ep. 70. ad Januar.

^x Firmil. Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 221.

^y Dionys. ap. Euseb. Lib. 7. c. 7.

^z Firmil. Ep. 75. p. 221. Non putant quærendum esse, quis sit ille qui baptizaverit, eo quod qui baptizatus sit, gratiam consequi potuerit invocata Trinitate nominum Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti.

^a Pearson. Annal. Cypr. an. 256. n. 3. p. 54.

Name of the Trinity or otherwise, were to be receiv'd without Distinction : but a great many things are said by the Learned *Pagi*^b to clear *Stephen* of this Imputation, and, I think, with Justice and Reason ; for this one Passage of *Firmilian* (which yet has escap'd the Observation of Learned Men on both sides) does abundantly vindicate him from the Charge ; for it shews plainly, he was not for receiving the Baptism of all Hereticks whatsoever, but such only as kept to the Form of the Church, and Baptiz'd in the Name of the Holy Trinity. And if there be any Expressions in *Stephen's* Letter to *Cyprian*, which seem to import more, they are candidly to be interpreted with this Restriction and Limitation. Which I observe for the sake of some late Ingenious Writers, who depending upon the venerable Authority of Bishop *Pearson*, have unwarily slid themselves, and led others into the same mistaken Opinion about *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* ; whereas *Vincentius Lirinensis*^c fully vindicates his Doctrine from the Charge of Novelty, and reckons it the true ancient Catholick Opinion : Nor do I know any ancient Writer that has passed any harder Censure on him for it, except such as were profest Abettors of *Cyprian's* Opinions, however they might dislike his fierce and immoderate Temper.

Thus then the Controversy stood at first, about the Rebaptization of Hereticks and Schismaticks. In the next Age the Dispute was resum'd again, and the Doctrine of *Stephen*, with a little Variation, was generally received, whilst the Doctrine of *Cyprian* was condemn'd in the Donatists, who pretended

^b *Pagi* Critic. in Baron. an. 256. n. 4.

^c *Vincent. Commonitor. adv. Hæres. c. 9.*

tended to be Followers of his Opinion. Now a Distinction was first made between Hereticks and Schismaticks, and then again between the several sorts of Hereticks : For some baptized in the Name of the Trinity, according to the Form of the Church, and others did not ; and of those who baptized in the Name of the Trinity, some were Heterodox, as to the true Faith of the Trinity ; others were Orthodox in that Point, but Heretical in other Opinions. And according to these Distinctions a difference was made in the Reception of their Baptisms. The Baptism of Schismaticks was generally receiv'd as valid, without any distinction : The Baptism of such Hereticks as did not baptize in the Name of the Trinity, and the Form of the Church was as generally rejected : But about the Baptism of those who gave Baptism in the Name of the Trinity, and yet did not believe the true Faith of the Trinity, as the *Arians* and some such others, there was still some Question remaining : For *Athanasius*, and *Optatus*, and some few others, thought it was not only necessary that Men should be baptized in the Name of the Trinity, but also into the true Faith of the Trinity ; and therefore they rejected the Baptism of the *Arians*, because tho' they observ'd the Form of Baptizing in the Name of the Trinity, as it was used in the Church, yet they did not baptize into the true Faith of the Trinity, because they denied the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost ; and therefore they thought their Baptism was not good, and ought to be repeated : But the generality of the Church were of another Mind, and therefore they receiv'd the Baptism of the *Arians* also, because they gave Baptism in the Name of the Trinity, tho' their Faith was not right about it. This was the true state of this Matter in the

IVth

IVth Century, when upon occasion of the Schism of the Donatists it came exactly to be consider'd. And of the truth of all this the Reader may satisfy himself from the Testimonies I shall lay before him.

The first Decree that was made in this Matter was in the great Council of *Arles*, *An.* 314. at which, *St. Austin* says^d, near Two-hundred of the Western Bishops were present, tho' few of their Subscriptions are now remaining. In this Council the Dispute about Heretical Baptisms was thus determin'd, according to the new Edition of *Sirmond*: 'We make this Decree concerning the
' *Africans*, who have been used to Rebaptize according to a peculiar Law^e of their own: If
' any one return from his Heresy to the Church,
' let the Catholick Priests question him about the
' Creed; and if they perceive that he was baptiz'd
' in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
' only Imposition of Hands shall be given him,
' that he may receive the Holy Ghost. But if upon
' Examination he answers not the Trinity,
' that is, that he was not baptized in the Name
' of the Trinity, let him be Rebaptized. ,, All that is here requir'd, is only that a Man be baptiz'd in the Name of the Trinity, or at most in
the

^d Aug. adv. Parmen. Lib. 1. c. 5.

^e Conc. Arelat. 1. can. 8. De Afris, qui propria sua Lege utuntur, ut rebaptizent, placuit, si ad Ecclesiam aliqui de hac hæresi venerint, interrogent eos nostræ fidei sacerdotes symbolum. Et si perviderint, in Patre & Filio & Spiritu Sancto eos baptizatos; manus eis tantum imponatur, ut accipiant Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogati non responderint hanc Trinitatem, baptizentur.

The old Editions read this Canon otherwise: De Arianis qui propria sua Lege utuntur, ut rebaptizentur, placuit, &c. And so it is alledged in Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. 4. c.

the Faith of the Trinity, to make Heretical Baptism valid. And no more is requir'd in the great Council of *Nice*, which has two Canons to this purpose: The first of which orders the *Novatian* Schismatics ^f to be admitted upon their Return, even to the same Degrees among the Clergy which they enjoy'd before, without any other Ceremony than Imposition of Hands. But the other ^g requires the *Paulianists*, or *Samosatenian* Hereticks to be Rebaptized. Hence it became a general Rule, that Schismatics were to be admitted universally without Rebaptizing; but Hereticks with some exception: For they who were in the Condition and Capacity of the *Samosatenians* were to be Rebaptized. But the Question may be, Upon what account the *Paulianists* are order'd to be Rebaptized more than other Hereticks? Was it because they did not baptize in the Name of the Trinity, or because they rejected the Doctrine of the Trinity, tho' they kept to the Form of the Church? *Athanasius* seems to have been of Opinion, that it was upon the latter account; for he rejects the Baptism of the *Arians*, tho' they baptized in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; because tho' they used the same Form of Baptism as was used in the Church, yet they did not believe as the Church believed of the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost. This I take to be the Meaning of that famous Passage in his third Oration against the *Arians* ^h, where he says, They did not baptize Men into the Faith of the

^f Conc. Nic. can. 8.

^g Ibid. can. 19.

^h Athan. Orat. 3. adv. Arian. Tom. I. p. 413. 'Ου γὰρ εἰς τὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν διδόντες δι' Ἀρειανῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς κτίσιν καὶ κτίσμα, καὶ εἰς πνῆμα καὶ ποιητὴν.

the Father and Son, but a Creator and a Creature, a Being made and the Maker of it. By which he did not mean, as some mistake him, that the *Arians* had chang'd the Form of Baptism; which they never did till the Time of *Eunomius*; but that tho' they baptized in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet they did not understand by those Names what the Church understood, but believed the Son and Holy Ghost to be meer Creatures; and therefore he thought their Baptism to be of no effect, because tho' they baptiz'd in the Form of the Church, yet not into the Faith of the Holy Trinity. And he concludes the same of the *Manichees* and *Montanists*, and *Samosatenians*, who, he thinks, used the Catholick Form of words, but rejected the true Sense and Meaning of them. Whence it is plain, *Athanasius* was one of those who neither universally received, nor universally rejected Heretical Baptisms; but such as were given in the Catholick Form of words, and in the true Faith of the Trinity, those only he admitted; refusing all others as Invalid, where either the Form or the Faith was wanting.

Optatus was of the same Opinion, that the Baptism of Schismatics was to be receiv'd as valid, without any Distinction, because they were baptiz'd i both in the Name and the Faith of the Trinity; and therefore he tells the *Donatists*, they never made any scruple about their Baptism, nor ever pretended to wash them over again: For as long as the Faith was the same, the Baptism

was

i *Optat. cont. Parmen. Lib. 5. p. 85. Quia quicquid in Trinitate factum fuerit, bene est: Inde est, quod simpliciter à vobis venientes excipimus, cum dicit, Non habet necessitatem iterum lavandi.*

was ^k the same; and the *Donatists* were rather to be blamed for Rebaptizing those who had been Baptiz'd in the Faith of the Trinity before. But as to the Hereticks he made a distinction: For some baptized neither in the Name, nor the Faith of the Trinity; and the Baptism of such Hereticks he calls sacrilegious ^l and prophane, and will not allow it to be the same with the one Baptism of the Church. The Reasons of making such Distinctions he assigns in the next words, when he says ^m, there are three Things concur in Baptism, 1. The Name of the Trinity. 2. The Faith of the Receiver. 3. The Administrator or Baptizer. But these three are not all of equal Weight and Necessity. The Trinity has the Principal place in the Action, without which Baptism cannot be performed: After this comes the Faith of the Believer: And then the Person of the Administrator, but that is not of equal Authority with the two former. Whence he concludes, that Baptism administred in the Name and in the Faith of the Trinity, whatever the Quality of the administrator might be, was not to be repeated.

St.

^k Optat. Ibid. p. 86. Si datis alterum baptisma, date alteram Fidem: Si datis alteram Fidem, date alterum Christum: Si datis alterum Christum, date alterum Deum.

^l Ibid. Per quod unum est, ab Hæreticorum prophanis & sacrilegis baptismatibus separatur.

^m Ibid. In hoc sacramento baptismatis celebrando, tres esse species constat, quas & vos nec augere, nec minuire, nec prætermittere poteritis. Prima species est in Trinitate, secunda in Credente, tertia in Operante. Sed non pari libramine ponderandæ sunt singulæ. Duas enim video necessarias, & unam quasi necessariam. Principalem locum Trinitas possidet, sine qua res ipsa non potest geri: Hanc sequitur Fides Credentis. Jam Persona Operantis vicina est, quæ simili autoritate esse non potest, &c.

St. *Basil* delivers his Opinion of these Baptisms much after the same manner. He thinks that as to the *Novatians*, and such other Schismaticks as did not err in Faith, the Custom of the Church in every Country was to be complied with, whether it was to baptize, or not baptize them again. But as to the *Pepuzians* or *Montanists* he thinks muchⁿ otherwise, and wonders how the great *Dionysius* could pass them over. For the Ancients decreed, that that Baptism only should be received, which did not recede from the Faith. Upon which account, he says, they distinguished betwixt Heresies, Schisms, and *μαρτυριαί*, Unlawful Assemblies. Heresies denoted such as departed from the Faith; Schisms, such as contended only about Questions of Ecclesiastical Discipline; and unlawful Assemblies were such as were held by Presbyters or Bishops that were Refractory, and would not submit to the Laws or Rules of the Church; but when they were censured for their Crimes, and suspended from officiating, would yet, notwithstanding the Canons, pretend to govern or minister as before, and draw People after them out of the Catholick Church. Now, he says, the Ancients thought the Baptism of Hereticks, such as the *Manichees*, *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, and *Pepuzians*, was to be wholly disannulled, because they were Dissenters about the Faith of GOD: But the Baptism of Schismaticks, as being yet of the Church, was to be received; and such as were baptized in unlawful Assemblies, being corrected by true Repentance and Conversion, were to be admitted again into the Church; as those Clergy also, who went off with their Refractory Leaders, were

ⁿ Basil. Ep. Canon. 1. ad Amphiloeh. can. 1.

were to be restor'd to their Station again upon their true Repentance. Hence he concludes, that the *Pepuzians* were to be rejected as Hereticks, because they blasphemed the Holy Ghost, attributing his Title to *Montanus* and *Priscilla*, and did not baptize in the Name of the Holy Ghost, but in the Name of Father, Son, and *Montanus*, or *Priscilla*. And tho' *Dionysius* had allowed their Baptism, yet we were not to follow him in that mistaken Practice. As to the *Novatians*, he says, *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* rejected their Baptisms, together with that of the *Encratitæ*, *Hydroparastatæ*, and *Apotactici*, being they were broken off from the Church by their Separation, and so neither had the Spirit themselves, nor could they give it to others, but were meer Laymen, who had no Power either to Baptize or Ordain; and therefore they ordered all such as were baptized by them, to be Rebaptized, as Persons baptized only by Laymen. This was the Practice of *Cyprian* and *Firmilian*: but forasmuch as many Churches in *Asia* receiv'd the Baptism of such by way of Dispensation, his Advice is, to permit it to be receiv'd, ἔστω δεκτόν, Only upon their Return they must receive the *Uction* of *Chrism* or Confirmation. Whence it is plain, *St. Basil* was not so Rigid as *Cyprian* in the Baptism of Schismatics; but for Hereticks, who made a Breach upon the Faith, he rejected their Baptism universally without Exception.

But the more general and prevailing Interpretation of the *Nicene Canon* was, that the Baptism of all Hereticks and Schismatics, who did not reject the Catholick Form of baptizing in the Name of the Trinity, was to be received, however they might be Heterodox in their Faith and Opinions. For they supposed the *Paulianists* were therefore to be Rebaptized, because they used another

another Form of Baptism. This was certainly the sense of the Council of *Laodicea*, and the Second General Council of *Constantinople*, and the Second Council of *Arles* and *Trullo*; as also of *St. Austin*, *St. Jerom*, *Gennadius*, *Ursinus Afer*, *Siricius*, *Leo*, *Innocentius*, the Author under the Name of *Justin Martyr*, and the generality of the ancient Writers.

The Council of *Laodicea* has two Canons to this purpose, in the former of which, all such as had been baptized by the *Novatians*, the *Photinians*, and the *Quartadeciman Hereticks*, are order'd to be receiv'd^o to a Participation of the Holy Mysteries, only first Anathematizing their Heresies, Learning the Catholick Creed, and being anointed with the Holy Chrism. Here is no mention of a new Baptism, but only Confirmation upon their Return to the Church. But in the next Canon, such as return from the Heresy of the *Cataphrygians* or *Montanists*, tho' they had been Ordain'd among their Clergy, and Dignify'd with the Title of *Maximi*, are appointed both to be Catechized and Baptized^p by the Bishops and Presbyters of the Church. Now, what should be the reason of making such a difference between the Baptism of the *Photinians* and the *Montanists* (since the *Photinians* were certainly as erroneous in their Opinions about the Trinity, as the *Montanists* could be) but only this, That the *Photinians*, tho' they did not believe the Divinity of CHRIST, yet they still kept to the Words and Form of the Catholick Baptism: But the *Montanists*, some think, chang'd the Form; for they did not Baptize in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but in the

F Name

^o Conc. Laodic. can. 7.

^p Ibid. can. 8.

Name of the Father, Son, and *Maximilla*, or *Montanus*, as *Theophylact* ^q and the Learned *Suicerus* ^r, and others have observ'd from him: Or else by their Errors they destroy'd the very Essence ^f of Baptism.

The like Difference was made by the Second General Council of *Constantinople*, *An.* 381. between the Baptism of the *Arians* and *Macedonians* on the one hand, and that of the *Eunomians*, *Montanists*, and *Sabellians* on the other. The *Arians* and *Macedonians* are join'd with the *Sabbatians*, and *Novatians*, and *Quartadecimans*, and *Apollinarians*; all which are to be receiv'd only by Consecration or *Uction* of the Holy Chrism, wherewith they are to be anointed on the Forehead, Eyes, Nose, Mouth, and Ears, with this Form of Words, *The Seal of the Gift of the Holy Spirit*. But for the *Eunomians*, *Montanists*, and *Sabellians*, and such other Hereticks, they are to be receiv'd in the same manner ^t as Heathens; which was by going thro' all the Stations of the Catechumens, in order as they are there mention'd, being the first Day made Christians at large, the second Day Catechumens, the third Day Exorcized, then Catechized and Trained up to the Discipline of the Church, and at last Baptized. Now here it is to be observ'd, that the *Arians* and *Eunomians* are but Branches of the same Heresy, and yet the one are order'd to be Rebaptized and the other not: The Reason of which was evidently this, That the one observ'd the same Form of Baptizing as was used in the Church,

^q Theophyl. Com. in Luc. 24. Basil. Ep. Canon. 1. can. 1.

^r Suicer. Thesaur. Eccl. Tom. 1. p. 638.

^f See this Matter fully discussed by the Learned Author of the late curious History of Montanism, Artic. 13. p. 168.

^t Conc. Constant. 1. can. 7.

Church, but the other had introduc'd a new Form of their own Inventing. For 'tis particularly noted of *Eunomius*, that he made a great many Innovations in this Matter: He baptized but with one Immerſion, as is noted in this Canon; and *Socrates* ^u ſays, that was not in the Name of the Trinity, but in the Death of CHRIST. *Epiphanius* alſo obſerves ^w how they rejected the Form of the Trinity, and baptized in the Name of the Uncreated God, and the Name of the Created God, and the Name of the Sanctifying Spirit, created by the Created Son. And *Gregory Nyſſen*, who wrote againſt *Eunomius* ^x, brings a like Charge againſt him. So that there was a plain Reason for the Councils ordering the *Eunomians* to be Rebaptized, whilſt they decreed otherwiſe about the *Arians*; for the *Arians*, properly ſo called, had made no ſuch Innovation, which was peculiar to the Followers of *Eunomius*.

The Second Council of *Arles* made two Decrees about Hereticks with the like Diſtinction. In one Canon the *Photinians* or *Paulianists* ^y are order'd to be Rebaptized, according to the Decrees of the Fathers; meaning, no doubt, the Decree of the *Nicene* Fathers made in that behalf. But the *Bonofiaci*, though they maintain'd the ſame Errors, yet becauſe they baptiz'd in the Name of the Trinity, as the *Arians* did, are ordered in the next ^z Canon to be receiv'd only with Chriſm

F 2

and

^u Socrat. Lib. 5. c. 24. ^w Epiphan. Hær. 76. Anomæor.

^x Nyſſen. adv. Eunom. Lib. 11. p. 706.

^y Conc. Arelat. 2. can. 16. Photinianos five Paulianistas, ſecundum Patrum Statuta, baptizari oportet.

^z Ibid. can. 17. Bonofiacos autem ex eodem errore venientes (quos, ſicut Arianos, baptizari in Trinitate manifeſtum eſt) dum interrogati Fidem noſtram ex toto corde confeſſi fuerint, Chriſmate & manus Impoſitione in Eccleſia recipi ſufficit.

and Imposition of Hands, as sufficient without a new Baptism.

The Council of *Trullo* treads in the Steps of the Councils of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, as to the Re-baptization of the *Paulianists*^a, the *Eunomians*, the *Montanists*, and the *Sabellians*; to which they add the *Manichees*, *Valentinians*, and *Marcionites*, and all such like Hereticks. But the *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Quartadecimans*, *Novatians*, *Apollinarians*, and, as they add, the *Nestorians*, might be received only by Chrism, without a new Baptism.

St. *Austin* delivers his sense of the *Nicene Canon* about the *Paulianists* after the same manner: He tells us, in his Opinion, the Reason why the Council appointed them to be Rebaptized^b was, because they did not observe the Form or Rule of Baptism, which many other Hereticks, when they left the Church, carried along with them, and continued still to observe it. So that, as he says in^c another place, One might easier find Hereticks that did not baptize at all, than such as did not baptize in that Form of Evangelical Words, of which the Creed consists, without which it was not the Baptism of CHRIST. Forasmuch then as they baptized generally in this Form, their Baptism was admitted as a complete Sacrament, tho' their

^a Conc. Trull. can. 95. al. 96.

^b Aug. de Hæres. c. 44. Istos sane Paulianos baptizandos esse in Ecclesia Catholica Niceno Concilio constitutum est. Unde credendum est eos Regulam baptismatis non tenere, quam secum multi Hæretici, cum de Catholica discederent, abstulerunt, eamque custodiunt.

^c Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 6. c. 25. Quis nescit non esse baptismum Christi, si verba Evangelica, quibus symbolum constat, illic defuerint? Sed facilius inveniuntur Hæretici, qui omnino non baptizant, quam qui illis verbis non baptizant.

their Faith was erroneous. And he makes ^d no scruple to say, ' That even the Baptism of *Marcion* ' himself would be true Baptism, if it were ministered in that Form of Evangelical Words, *In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, tho' his Belief under those Words was not the true Faith of the Catholick Church, but corrupted with false and fabulous Doctrines. ,, He also assigns the Grounds and Reasons of this Practice, why the Catholick Church did not ^e repeat their Baptism, ' Because the Baptism given by Hereticks ' was not, properly speaking, their Baptism, but ' the Baptism of CHRIST; which they that once ' had, could never lose by going out of the ' Church, and consequently were not to be admitted into the Church again by Rebaptization, ' but Repentance. ,, The Church corrected the Errors ^f of their Understanding, upon their Return, but did not violate the Sacrament of GOD. And he challenges the *Donatists* ^g to shew him any Instance of any Man that was ever Rebaptized by the Catholicks, after he had been once Baptized

F 3

in

^d Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 3. c. 15. Quamobrem si Evangelicis verbis, in nomine Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti, Marcion baptismum consecrabat, integrum erat Sacramentum, quamvis ejus fides sub eisdem verbis aliud opinantis, quam Catholica veritas docet, non esset integra, sed fabulosis falsitatibus inquinata.

^e Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 3. c. 11. Catholica vero propterea non debet iterare baptismum, qui apud Hæreticos datus est, ne judicare videatur ipsorum esse quod Christi est; aut eos non habere, quod intus cum acceperint, amittere utique foras exeundo non possunt, &c.

^f Id. de unico Baptismo cont. Petilian. c. 3. Si de ipsa Trinitatis unitate dissentientem hæreticum invenio, & tamen Evangelica & Ecclesiastica Regula baptizatum; intellectum hominis corrigo, non Dei violo Sacramentum.

^g Aug. adv. Fulgent. c. 7. Da mihi aliquem Sanctorum post Trinitatem rebaptizare, quod facis.

in the Name of the Trinity, as the *Donatists* did. Which shews, that this was the peculiar Practice of the *Donatists*, and not of the Catholick Church.

St. *Jerom* argues upon the same Foot against *Hilary* the Deacon, whom he stiles *Deucalion Orbis*, the Rebaptizer of the World, because he was for Rebaptizing all those that had been Baptized by the *Arian* Hereticks. *Hilary* it seems had gone one step farther than his Master *Lucifer*, and the rest of the *Luciferians*; for they allowed the Baptism of the *Arians*, tho' they did not allow their Orders, nor grant them in any sense to be Christians, but said they were of the Synagogue of Satan. Yet they received such as were Baptized by the *Arians*^h, not by giving them a new Baptism, but only by admitting them to a State of Repentance: So they allow'd the Baptism of those whom they did not allow to be Priests, nor so much as Christian Laymen. But *Hilary* here deserted his Leaders, and carried the Matter one Degree farther: He said the *Arian* Priests were not only to be Deposed, but their Laicks also to be Rebaptized. ⁱ Against whom St. *Jerom* urges not only the contrary Concessions and Practice of his Master *Lucifer*, but also the Testimony of Scripture^k, proving from the *Revelations*, That such

^h Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucif. c. 1. Orthodox. Si Ariani, ut dicis, Gentiles sunt, & Arianorum conventicula castra sunt Diaboli: quomodo in castris Diaboli baptizatum recipis? Lucif. Recipio, sed poenitentem. --- Aio Laicum ab Arianis venientem recipi debere poenitentem, Clericum vero non debere. It. c. 5. Orthodox. Eadem ratione à nobis Episcopum recipi, quia Laicus à vobis recipitur.

ⁱ Ibid. c. 8. Differas quid adversum Hilarium dicendum sit, qui nec baptizatos quidem recipiat ab Arianis.

^k Ibid. c. 8. De Apocalypsi quoque approbemus Hæreticis sine baptismo debere poenitentiam concedi. --- Nunquid dixit, Rebaptizentur, qui in Nicolaitarum fidem baptizati sunt?

such as were baptized by Hereticks might be received, upon their Repentance, without Rebaptizing: For the *Nicolaitans* were Hereticks, and yet there was no Command given, that they who were baptized by them should be baptized again. Then he proves the same from the constant Practice of the *Roman Church*, where *Hilary* himself was baptized, who could be no Christian if his own Doctrine were true; for he was baptized in a Church which had always received Baptism from Hereticks. Nay, he himself, ^l whilst he was Deacon of that Church, had receiv'd the Baptism of the *Manichees* and *Ebionites*; but as soon as *Arius* arose, he was all on a sudden displeased with himself, and opened a new Baptistry against the Church. He that was born in the Bosom of the Church, he that was nourish'd with the Milk of her Breasts, lift up his Sword against her; calling her Harlot, and yet that Harlot must be his Mother, else he could not prove himself a Christian. Finally, he concludes both against *Hilary* and his Master *Lucifer*, from the Authority of the Council of *Nice*, which receiv'd all Hereticks, except the *Samosatenians*, and not only admitted the Baptism of the *Novatians*, but allow'd their Clergy to continue their Station in the Church.

In like manner *Gennadius* tells us ^m, All such as were baptized by Hereticks in the Name or Confession of the Trinity, were receiv'd as truly baptized, when they came over to the Church. And then if they consented to profess the true Faith,

F 4

they

^l Hieron. *ibid.* cap. 9.

^m Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. c. 52. Si qui apud illos Hæreticos baptizati sunt, qui in Sanctæ Trinitatis Confessione baptizant, & veniunt ad nos, recipiantur quidem ut baptizati. --- Et si consentiunt credere, vel acquiescunt confiteri, purgati jam fidei Integritate, confirmantur manus Impositione, &c.

they were Confirmed by Imposition of Hands, and so admitted to the Participation of the Eucharist.

The same Author mentions a Book of one *Ursinus Afer*,ⁿ written on purpose against those who were for Rebaptizing all Hereticks, wherein he prov'd, That such as were either baptized in the Name of CHRIST, or in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were not to be Rebaptized, tho' they understood the words in an Heterodox sense: But when they made Confession of the Trinity, the Bishop's Confirmation by Imposition of Hands was sufficient for their Salvation.

About this time liv'd the Author of the Questions and Responses, which go under the Name of *Justin Martyr*: Among other Questions he proposes this for one; 'If the Baptism^o administred by Hereticks be adulterated and vain, why then do not the Orthodox rebaptize an Heretick when he comes over to the Catholick Faith, but allow his adulterated Baptism, as well as that which is true? To which he answers, That when an Heretick comes over to the Catholick Faith, the Fault of his Heterodoxy is corrected by the change

ⁿ Gennad. de Scriptor. Eccl. c. 27. Ursinus Monachus Scriptit adversus eos qui rebaptizandos hæreticos decernunt, docens nec legitimum nec Deo dignum rebaptizari illos, qui in nomine vel simpliciter Christi, vel in nomine Patris, Filii & Spiritus Sancti, quamvis pravo sensu, baptizentur: Iis autem post Sanctæ Trinitatis & Christi Simplicem Confessionem, sufficere ad salutem manus Impositionem Catholici Sacerdotis.

^o Justin. Quæst. 14. ad Orthodox. 'Εἰ ἐψευσμένον τυγχάνει καὶ μάταιον τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν αἰρετικῶν διδόμενον βάπτισμα, διὰ τί οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι τὴν προσφύροντα τῇ ὀρθοδοξίᾳ αἰρετικὸν ἔβαπτίζουσιν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τῷ νόθῳ ἔωσι βαπτίσματα.

Respons. ibid. Τὰ αἰρετικὰ ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρθοδοξίαν ἐρχομένα τὸ σφάλμα διορθῶνται, τῆς μὲν κακοδοξίας, τῇ μεταθέσει τῆς φρονήματος· τὸ δὲ βαπτίσματος, τῇ ἐπιχρίσει τῶν ἀγίων μύρων.

‘ change of his Opinion ; and the Faultiness of
 ‘ his Baptism by the Unction of the Holy Chrism.,
 Here we see, he does not deny but that the Baptism of Hereticks is very Faulty ; nay, adulterated, spurious, and vain, as to any Spiritual Effects, whilst they continue Hereticks ; and yet when they come over to the Catholick Church, their Baptism is not to be repeated, as simply Null and Invalid, but to be corrected, amended, and completed in its Deficiencies by the Ministry of Confirmation, which the *Greeks* call Chrism or the Holy Unction. And thus we are to understand the Word *μάταιος*, vain, as it is used by *Ignatius*, and the Author of the *Constitutions*, and other *Greek* Writers, when they speak of the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics, not as denoting simply the Nullity and Invalidity of it, but the sinfulness of the Action in giving Baptism out of the Church, and the Inefficacy of it as to Salvation, or any other Spiritual Effects, till Men return from their Heresies and Schisms to the Unity of the Church again.

Pope *Leo* denies the Spiritual Efficacy of Heretical Baptism, as much as any Man ; and yet he was utterly against Rebaptizing : For he gives this Direction to *Nicetius* Bishop of *Aquileia*, ‘ That
 ‘ such as receiv’d Baptism from Hereticks, having not been baptiz’d before, were to be receiv’d
 ‘ only by Invocation of the Holy Spirit and Imposition of Hands ; and that because they had before
 ‘ only receiv’d the Form of Baptism, without the
 ‘ sancti-

p Leo. Ep. 77. al. 79. ad Nicet. c. 7. Hi qui baptismum ab Hæreticis acceperunt, cum baptizati antea non fuissent, sola Invocatione Spiritus Sancti per Impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt, quia Formam tantum baptismi sine Sanctificationis virtute sumpserunt.

‘sanctifying Power of it. He gives a like Resolution to the Question of *Rusticus Narbonensis*: ‘Those
 ‘that know & they have been baptiz’d in the Form
 ‘of the Church, but know not what Faith they
 ‘were of that baptized them, are not to be re-
 ‘baptized; but by Imposition of Hands, and In-
 ‘vocation of the Holy Spirit, whose Grace they
 ‘could not have from Hereticks, are to be uni-
 ‘ted to the Communion of Catholicks.,, And
 this he learned from the Practice of his Prede-
 cessors, *Innocentius* and *Siricius*; whereof the one
 says, ^r ‘It was their Custom to receive into the
 ‘Communion of Catholicks, as well *Arians* as
 ‘*Novatians*, and other Hereticks, only by Invo-
 ‘cation of the Seven Graces of the Spirit, with
 ‘Imposition of the Bishop’s Hands, as it had been
 ‘decreed in Council. Meaning the Decree which
 the Council of *Nice*, or the Council of *Arles* had
 made to this purpose. And this, he says, was
 then observed both in the Eastern and Western
 Churches. His other Predecessor, *Innocentius*, af-
 firms ^f the same, ‘That the Baptism of the *Arians*
 ‘was

^q Leo. Ep. 92. ad Rustic. c. 16. Qui se baptizatos sciunt, sed cujus fidei fuerint, qui se baptizavere, se nescire profitentur, quolibet modo Formam baptismatis acceperint, rebaptizandi non sunt: Sed per manus Impositionem, invocata virtute Spiritus Sancti, quam ab hæreticis accipere non potuerunt, Catholicis copulandi sunt. It. Ep. 37. ad Leon. Raven. c. 2.

^r Siric. Ep. 1. ad Himerium Tarracon. c. 1. Arianos nos cum Novatianis aliisque Hæreticis, sicut est in synodo constitutum, per Invocationem solam septiformis Spiritus, Episcopalis manus Impositione, Catholicorum conventui sociamus. Quod etiam totus Oriens Occidentisque custodit.

^f Innocent. Ep. 18. ad Alexand. Antioch. c. 3. Arrianos cæterasque hujusmodi Pestes, quia eorum Laicos conversos ad Dominum sub imagine poenitentiae ac Sancti Spiritus Sanctificatione per manus impositionem suscipimus, non videtur Clericos eorum cum sacerdotii cujuscumque suscipi debere dignitate; quoniam iis solum baptismum ratum esse permittimus, quod utique in Nomine Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti perficitur.

‘ was allowed as valid ; and when they were con-
 ‘ verted they were received by Penance and Im-
 ‘ position of Hands, which was the means of
 ‘ procuring for them the Sanctification of the
 ‘ Holy Spirit. , And so for the *Novatians* and
Donatists, he determines, ^t ‘ That those who came
 ‘ over from them, should be received only by
 ‘ Imposition of Hands ; because tho’ they were
 ‘ baptized by Hereticks, yet they were baptized
 ‘ in the Name of CHRIST.

In another place ^u he explains the Reason, why
 the Council of *Nice* allow’d the Baptism of the
Novatians, but not the *Paulianists* ; ‘ because the
 ‘ *Paulianists* did not Baptize in the Name of the
 ‘ Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which the *Novatians*
 ‘ did, who, in the Point of the Divine Power
 ‘ of the Trinity, always maintain’d the Orthodox
 ‘ Faith. , Such therefore as came over from
 Heresies of the like kind with the *Novatians*, it
 was the Custom ^w of the Church of *Rome* to re-
 ceive with Imposition of Hands to Lay-Communion,
 but not to allow them Orders, he says ;
 which was a Matter of Discipline, in which the
 Church used a liberty to extend or relax her Cen-
 sures, as she thought proper in her own Wisdom
 and

^t Id. Ep. 1. ad Victricium. c. 8. Ut venientes à Novatianis vel Montensibus, per manus tantum Impositionem suscipiantur: quia quamvis ab hæreticis, tamen in Christi nomine sunt baptizati.

^u Innocent. Ep. 22. ad Episcopos Macedon. c. 5. Idcirco distinctum esse ipsis duabus Hæresibus ratio manifesta declarat: Quia Paulianistæ in nomine Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti minime baptizant: Et Novatiani iisdem tremendis venerandisque nominibus baptizant, &c.

^w Ibid. c. 4. Nostræ Lex Ecclesiæ est, venientibus ab Hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sunt, per manus Impositionem Laicam tantum tribuere Communionem, nec ex his aliquem in Clericatus honorem vel exiguum subrogare.

and Discretion. It were easy to add many other Testimonies of the like nature; but I suppose these are abundantly sufficient both to evince and explain the general Sense of the Church upon this Head, that they allowed as Valid the Baptism of all Hereticks that baptized in the name of the Trinity; tho' some few required they should be baptized in the true Faith, as well as the true Form, to make their Baptism effectual.

§. 21.

What Defects there are in the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics, and how those Defects are supplied.

But now tho' the Baptism of Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded or Excommunicated Clerks was reputed valid, so as it needed not to be repeated; yet it was not esteem'd so perfect to all Intents and Purposes as the Regular and Authorized Baptism of the Church, because both on the Part of the Receiver, and on the Part of the Giver there were some Deficiencies in it. We must therefore enquire, in the next place, What the Ancients supposed such Baptism could give? Then, what were its Deficiencies, and what it could not give? and, How those Deficiencies were supplied? For the Resolution of these Questions, St. *Austin*, who has consider'd this Matter most exactly, often inculcates a known Distinction between the External or Visible Sacrament, and the Invisible or Spiritual Grace; the former of which ^x is common both to Good and Bad Men in the Church; but the latter is peculiar only to those that are Good. Now he supposes
such

^x Aug. cont. Liter. Petilian. Lib. 2. c. 104. Discerne Visibile Sanctum Sacramentum, quod esse & in bonis & in malis potest, illis ad præmium, istis ad judicium, ab Invisibili unctione Charitatis, quæ propria bonorum est.

such as are baptized by Hereticks and Schismatics, to be much in the same state as Bad Men in the Church : They receive the outward Visible Sacrament, but not the Invisible, Internal, and Sanctifying Grace of the Spirit. So that it cannot be said, that they receive nothing at all ; for they receive as much, almost, as wicked Men in the Church ; of whom it may be truly said, that they have receiv'd the Sacrament of Baptism, and need not, upon any Occasion, to be Rebaptized again : And farther, that they are hereby made Partakers of all such Privileges, as the receiving the Outward and Visible Sacrament of Baptism can give to such, as debar themselves (by some Obstacle of their own) from the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of it. Their Baptism makes them something more than meer Heathens, who need Baptism before they can come into the Church : It gives them a Title to be Members of the Visible Church at large, tho' they are not true Members of the Invisible and Spiritual Church, because they are not yet sanctified by the Spirit of CHRIST : It qualifies them for Pardon upon their Repentance, whenever they return from their vicious Practices, and take away those Bars and Obstacles that hindered the Descent of the Spirit at their first Admission ; nay, though they turn Hereticks, or Schismatics, or become Lapfers, or Excommunicate, or even Apostates, they need not a new Baptism, but only Repentance and Absolution, to return to the Church again ; the Seal and Character of their Baptism remaining in this respect for ever Indelible upon them, so as to qualify them to be admitted ever after to Pardon and Forgiveness, upon a true Repentance. These are Privileges that a wicked Man has, by vertue of his having received the Outward Form
of

of Baptism, or the Visible Sacrament in the Church, tho' all the time, by his own Fault, he be destitute of Pardon of Sins, and all the Invisible Graces and Operations of the Holy Spirit. As the Baptism of *Simon Magnus* was a true Baptism, tho' he was an Unworthy, and therefore an Unprofitable Receiver of it: And as the Sacrament of the Eucharist is a true Sacrament, tho' many Men eat it not to their Soul's Health, but to their own Damnation, because they are unworthy Receivers of it.

Now as the Case was with Wicked Men, who thus received Baptism in the Church, that they gained hereby some Privileges, but not all, nor the chief of those that belonged to it: So the Ancients supposed the Case of those to be, who were baptized in an Uncharitable Opposition and Contempt of Authority, by Hereticks, or Schismatics, or Excommunicate and Degraded Clergymen: Their Baptism, if done in due Form, intitled them to some Privileges, but not all that might be expected from it in the Church: It was the Visible Sacrament of Baptism, and therefore made them something more than Heathens, and qualified them for some, if not all, of the forementioned Privileges; so that upon their Repentance and Return to the Church, they needed not to be received as meer Heathens, by having their Baptism repeated again: But then it wanted the Internal and Invisible Grace, particularly the Grace of Unity and Charity, which completes all other Graces, and which Hereticks and Schismatics were not supposed qualified to give, nor they who desired Baptism at their hands, qualified to receive, till they returned with Repentance and Charity to the Unity of the Church again: And then the Church by Imposition of Hands, and Invocation of
of

of the Holy Spirit, might obtain for them those Blessings and Graces, which might have been had in Baptism, if they themselves had not been the Obstacle, and put in a Bar against them. This I take to be the true state of this Matter, as generally delivered by such of the Ancients as defended the Validity of Heretical Baptism. For as to those who pleaded against it, and stood up for Rebaptization, they argued upon a quite contrary and mistaken Notion, That the Visible Sacrament and the Invisible Grace must necessarily be united together to make a true Sacrament; and that neither could the Spirit operate without the Water, nor the Water without the Spirit. Which was the chief Argument used by *Nemesianus a Tubunis*, in the famous Council of *Carthage*, for Rebaptization under *Cyprian*: To which *St. Austin* returns a very satisfactory Answer, upon *Cyprian's* own Principles, only by distinguishing a double Notion y of the Spirit: For if the Presence of the Spirit be necessary to every true Baptism, it must be only in such a sense as *Simon Magus*, or any other wicked Wretch, who is baptized in the Church, may be said to be born again of Water and of the Spirit, who

y Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 6. c. 12. Nam & Simon ille Magus natus erat ex aqua & Spiritu, & tamen non intravit in regnum coelorum. Sic fieri potest ut Hæreticis etiam contingat. Aut si non nascitur ex Spiritu nisi qui veraci conversione mutatur, omnes qui sæculo verbis & non factis renunciant, non utique de Spiritu, sed ex aqua sola nascuntur, qui tamen & intus teste Cypriano sunt. Necessè est enim ut unum de duobus concedatur; aut illi qui fallaciter sæculo renunciant, nascuntur de spiritu, quamvis ad perniciem, non ad salutem, atque ita possunt & Hæretici: Aut si illud quod Scriptum est: Sanctus Spiritus Disciplinæ effugiet fictum, etiam ad hoc valet, ut fallaciter sæculo renunciantes, non nascantur de Spiritu, potest quis baptizari aqua, & non nasci de Spiritu. Et frustra Nemesianus ait, neque Spiritus sine aqua operari potest, neque aqua sine Spiritu.

‘who yet shall never enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. And the Case of Hereticks may be such, *i. e.* to be born of Water and the Spirit without Salvation. But if by the Spirit be meant only the Spirit of true Conversion, then all those who renounce the World in Words and not in Deeds, are not born of the Spirit, but of Water alone, who yet in *Cyprian’s* Opinion, are truly baptized in the Church. For one of these two things must needs be granted: Either those who fallaciously renounce the World, are born of the Spirit, tho’ to their Destruction, not Salvation; and then Hereticks may be so too: Or else, if that saying of the Book of Wisdom, *The Holy Spirit of Discipline will not dwell with an Hypocrite*, be taken to signify, that they who fallaciously renounce the World, are not born of the Spirit; then a Man may be born of Water alone and not of the Spirit. And *Nemesianus* disputed to no purpose, when he said, ‘That the Spirit cannot operate without the Water, nor the Water without the Spirit.’ It is plain from this Discourse of *St. Austin*, that the great Deficiency of Heretical Baptism was, that either it did not minister the Spirit at all, or else at least not to such a Degree, as was effectual to Sanctification and Salvation. And this Deficiency was therefore necessary to be supplied upon their Return to the Catholick Church. There was but one Case, he thinks, in which Heretical Baptism could avail any Man to Salvation, and that was when it was such a Case of necessity ^z as that

^z Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 7. c. 52. Illi qui sic sunt in magna Domino tanquam vasa in contumeliam--- neque omnino utiliter habent baptismum, neque ab eis utiliter accipitur, nisi forte accipiendi necessitas urgeat, & accipientis animus ab unitatis vinculo

that a Man could not have Baptism from any other, and then the Man, in heart, was still united to the Catholick Church: but in all other Cases their Baptism was unprofitably received; and to make it otherwise it was necessary for Men to forsake their Heresy or Schism, and join themselves to the Catholick Church. Even as they who were in the Church by the Communion of the Sacraments, but out of it by the diversity of their Morals, were obliged to reform their Lives, in order to make their Baptism profitable, which before was of little Advantage to them. Therefore *St. Austin* says, he had no Dispute with *Cyprian* upon this Point; he agreed entirely^a with him thus far, That Hereticks could not grant Remission of Sins: This was the Deficiency of their Baptism, which both in the Giver and Receiver was only to Destruction, because they misused so great a Gift of God. But then the same Deficiency was many times in the Baptism of those who were baptized in the Church, because they were baptized in Enmity and Hatred of their Brethren, and in that State could not have Forgiveness of Sins: Yet this Deficiency was not supply'd by a new Baptism, but by Repentance

G

and

culo non recedat: Tamen habent, quanquam inutiliter habeant, & accipitur ab eis, etiam cum inutile est accipientibus: Quod ut fiat utile, ab Hæresi vel Schismate recedendum est, & illi Domui cohærendum, &c.

^a Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 5. c. 22. Proinde consentimus Cypriano, Hæreticos remissionem dare non posse; Baptismum autem dare posse, quod quidem illis & dantibus & accipientibus valeat ad perniciem, tanquam tanto munere Dei male utentibus. ----- Quanto magis fieri non potest, ut eis peccata dimittantur, qui fratres oderunt, & in ipso odio baptizantur: quibus tamen postea correctis non rursus Baptismus datur, sed ipsa venia, quam tunc accipere non meruerunt, in vera Conversione præstatur.

and true Conversion, whereby that Pardon was obtain'd, which they had not merited, nor were qualify'd to receive before.

Nor was this the singular Opinion of St. *Austin* about the Deficiency of Heretical Baptism, but the general sense of the Church : For which Reason they appointed that Imposition of Hands should be given to such as returned to the Church, in order to obtain the Grace of the Holy Ghost for them by Prayer, which they wanted before, as having received Baptism from those who had no Power to give the Holy Ghost. For thus *Innocent*, Bishop of *Rome*, who was Cotemporary with St. *Austin*, says of the Baptism of the *Arians*,
 ' That their Ministration ^b was defective in this,
 ' that they could not give the Holy Ghost; and
 ' therefore such as were baptized by them were
 ' Imperfect, and were to be receiv'd with Imposi-
 ' tion of Hands, that they might thereby obtain
 ' the Grace of the Holy Ghost. Pope *Leo* ^c says,
 ' They had only the Form of Baptism, without
 ' the Grace of Sanctification; and therefore when
 ' they came over to the Catholick Church, tho'
 ' the Form of Baptism was not to be repeated,
 ' yet what was wanting in it was to be supplied,
 ' that

^b Innocent. Ep. 18. ad Alexand. Antiochen. c. 3. Nec Spiritum Sanctum eos habere ex illo baptismo, illisque Mysteriis arbitramur: Quoniam cum à Catholica fide eorum Authores deficerent, perfectionem Spiritus quam acceperant, amiserunt. ----- Horum Laicos imperfectos, ut dixi, ad Sancti Spiritus percipiendam gratiam cum pœnitentiæ imagine recipimus.

^c Leo Ep. 79. ad Nicet. c. 7. & Ep. 92. ad Rustic. c. 16. Cited in the last Section.

It. Ep. 37. ad Leon. Raven. c. 2. Si ab Hæreticis baptizatum quempiam constiterit, erga hunc nullatenus Sacramentum Regenerationis iteretur: Sed hoc tantum, quod ibi deficit, conferratur, ut per Episcopalem manus Impositionem virtutem Sancti Spiritus consequatur.

‘ that by Imposition of the Bishop’s Hands they
 ‘ might receive the Grace of the Holy Ghost. ,,
 And that this was the true and only Method of
 supplying the Defects of Heretical Baptism, is
 evident from all the Passages that have been al-
 ledged in the last Section, which speak of the use
 of the Sacred Unction, which was join’d with
 Imposition of Hands and Prayer, to implore the
 Grace of Remission of Sins, and the other Gifts
 of the Holy Spirit, which were wanting before.
 To all which I shall only add these two Observa-
 tions farther, to shew the necessity of supplying
 the Defects of Heretical and Schismatical Baptism
 by Confirmation, or Imposition of Hands and
 Prayer, upon Mens Reconciliation and Returning
 to the Catholick Church. The first is, That Im-
 position of Hands or Confirmation was thought
 so necessary in this Case, that tho’ it was Ordina-
 rily only the Office of the Bishop to perform it,
 yet in Cases of extreme Necessity, when one who
 had been baptized by Hereticks, was in danger of
 Death, and could not come to the Bishop, a Pres-
 byter, in that Exigency, was authorized to give
 him that solemn Imposition of Hands used in the
 Prayer of Confirmation, and Invocation of the
 Holy Spirit, rather than he should die without it.
 This is evident from the first Council^d of *Orange*,
 which made this Decree, ‘ That if any Hereticks
 ‘ at the Point of Death, desire to be received as
 ‘ Catholicks, in the absence of the Bishop, the
 ‘ Presbyters shall give them the Consignation of
 ‘ Chrism and the Benediction. , And so in the
 G 2 Coun-

^d Conc. Arausi. can. 1. c. 2. Hæreticos in mortis discrimine
 positos, si Catholici esse desiderent, si desit Episcopus, à Presby-
 teris cum Chrismate & Benedictione consignari placet.

Council of *Epone*^e a like Order was made, ' That
 ' if any Hereticks, who lay desperately Sick upon
 ' their Beds, desired suddenly to be converted, in
 ' that case, for the Salvation of their Souls, which
 ' was heartily desired, a Presbyter is permitted to
 ' give them the Consolation of Chrism. Which
 those that were in Health were to go to the Bishop
 for at their Conversion. Here we may take notice,
 that this Confirmation, or solemn Invocation
 of the Holy Spirit, was thought more necessary
 for such as were baptized by Hereticks and Schismatics,
 upon their return to the Church, than for those that
 were baptized in the Church: For many of those who
 were baptized in the Church, in Country-Towns and
 Villages, died, as St. *Jerom* observes, ^f before the Bishop
 could come to give them Confirmation; and yet no such
 Rule was made in that Case, for Presbyters to Confirm
 them: The reason of which was, that they had received
 the Grace of the Holy Spirit in their Baptism (which
 Hereticks had not) and therefore there was no such
 absolute necessity of Confirming them in order to die
 in Peace and Safety: But Hereticks could not die
 securely without it; and therefore the Church, in
 Compassion to dying Here-

^e Conc. Epaunens. can. 16. Presbytero, propter salutem animarum, quam in cunctis optamus desperatis & in lecto decumbentibus Hæreticis, si Conversionem subitam petant, Chrismate subvenire permittimus. Quod etiam omnes conversuri, si sani sunt, ab Episcopo noverint expetendum.

^f Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucif. cap. 4. Id factum reperimus ad honorem potius sacerdotii, quam ad legis necessitatem. Alioquin si Episcopi tantum Imprecatione Spiritus Sanctus defluit: Iugendi sunt qui in Villulis aut in Castellis aut in remotioribus locis per Presbyteros & Diaconos baptizati, ante dormierunt, quam ab Episcopis inviserentur. *He says a little before, Spiritum Sanctum nos asserimus in vero baptismo tribui.*

Hereticks, authorized even Presbyters in Cases of extreme Necessity to give them Confirmation, which in other Cases was the ordinary Office of the Episcopal Function. 2^{dly}. The other Observation I would make in relation to this matter is, That Imposition of Hands was thought so necessary for Hereticks upon their Return, that even those who had received it before in their Heretical Baptism, received it again when they were reconciled to the Church. The reason of which was, because Hereticks and Schismatics, during their Separation, were supposed neither qualified to give nor receive the Holy Ghost, either by Baptism, or Imposition of Hands, or the Consecration of Chrism: For some Hereticks ministered all these, and yet Imposition of Hands was given them again when they returned to the Church. This is plain in the Case of the *Donatists*. They not only retained Baptism, but also the Unction of Chrism and Imposition of Hands, as the Church did. For so both St. *Austin* & *Optatus* testify of them. And yet they could not give the Holy Spirit by any of them. Therefore when they came over to the Church, tho' neither the outward Form of Baptism nor Chrism was repeated upon them, yet Imposition of Hands was repeated, because that was no more than a Prayer to implore the Gift of the Holy Ghost to descend upon them, which might be repeated as often as there was occasion for it. *Optatus* says expressly, 'That neither the

G 3

Baptism

g Aug. cont. Literas Petilian. Lib. 2. c. 104. In hoc unguento Sacramentum Chrismatis vultis interpretari, quod quidem in genere visibilium signaculorum Sacrosanctum est, sicut ipse Baptismus: Sed potest esse & in hominibus pessimis, in operibus carnis vitam consummentibus, & regnum coelorum non possessoris.

' Baptism nor the Unction^h of the *Donatists* was
 ' repeated: But Imposition of Hands was repeated,
 ' because this was necessary as a Prayer to implore
 ' the Divine Blessing, and convey the Invisible
 ' Unction of the Holy Spirit to them, which
 ' they were not in a capacity to receive before.
 Therefore St. *Austin*ⁱ says, ' Imposition of Hands
 ' was not like Baptism, a thing that might not be
 ' repeated: For it was no more than praying over
 ' a Man for a Blessing. Which may be done when-
 ' ever there is occasion for it. And therefore it was
 thought necessary to be done when Hereticks
 came over to the Church, to supply the Defects
 of their Baptism, which did not minister with the
 outward Visible Form the Invisible Grace of the
 Holy Spirit before. I have said thus much upon
 this Head, to shew those who are baptized in He-
 resy or Schism, what was the true ancient Method
 of Reconciliation, and the way to die securely in
 the Peace and Communion of the Church. And
 if all Persons concerned would observe this Me-
 thod, there would be no need of Disputes about
 Rebaptization in the Church. For it appears,
 that the unauthorized Baptism of Hereticks and
 Schismatics may be reputed Valid, and without
 Rebaptizing have its Defects supplied by Imposi-
 tion of Hands in Confirmation.

There

^h Optat. cont. Parmen. Lib. 7. p. 109. Quod à vobis unctum
 est, tale servamus, quale accepimus, &c.

ⁱ Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 3. c. 16. Manus autem Impositio non
 sicut Baptismus repeti non potest. Quid enim aliud est, nisi O-
 ratio super hominem?

Alcim. Avitus Ep. 24. ad Stephan. Manus Impositionem
 Personæ, de qua scribitis, adhibete; quam constat, si revera
 in supradicti Schismatis Professione versata est, cum ministerio
 Baptismatis etiam Chrismate consignatam.

There remains one Question more to be resolved concerning Hereticks and Schismatics and Degraded Clergymen; Whether in that Capacity, as they were Unauthorized in all their Ministrations, they were reputed to be of the Body of the Clergy, or of the Laity, or in a middle Rank betwixt both? And whether the Baptisms administered by them in such a State, were of any greater Account than the Baptisms of Unauthorized Laymen? This Question is much of the same Nature with that other, Whether an Heretick be a Christian? Which is not to be resolved without a nice Distinction. For if by a Christian be meant one that is not a meer Heathen, but one that has received Baptism so firm and valid, as that if the Man turns Heretick, or Schismatick, or Apostate, or becomes Excommunicate, his Baptism notwithstanding will remain so Indelible and Inviolable, as that he shall never need a second Baptism to be admitted into the Church again: In this Sense the Ancients would make no scruple to affirm, that Hereticks were Christians. But if by a Christian be meant one that is of the Catholick and Orthodox Faith, and in the Bosom and Unity of the Holy Catholick Church; then they would make as little scruple to deny Hereticks to be Christians, but compare them to Jews and Pagans, as being Enemies to true Religion and destitute of the Means of Salvation as well as the other, as I have had occasion to shew in another ^k Discourse.

§. 22.
Whether the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics be any more than the Baptism of Unauthorized Laymen.

Now the Question, Whether Hereticks be Clergymen or Laymen, Priests or not Priests, Bishops

G 4 or

^k Origin. Eccles. Lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 4.

or not Bishops, is to be resolved much after the same manner. If by a Bishop or Priest be meant one that has received such an Ordination from the Church to the Office of Bishop or Priest, as that if the Man turns Heretick, or Schismatick, or Apostate, or is Excommunicate, or Degraded, yet his Ordination remains so far Indelible and Inviolable, as that if the Church thinks fit, after all his Crimes and Suspensions, to admit him, upon his Repentance, to Officiate in that Station again, he shall not need a new Ordination to qualifie him for it: In this sense there are none among the Ancients but will allow Hereticks and Schismaticks to be Bishops or Priests, according to their respective Orders. Some indeed were against their being allowed to officiate in those Dignities, and were for depriving them wholly of those Honours, when they returned to the Catholick Church, as thinking them unworthy to enjoy those Privileges, who had so manifestly prevaricated with the Church, and gone contrary to the Design and Duties of their Station. But none ever said, that if the Church should think fit to allow them to continue in her Service, she must of necessity give them a new Ordination. Thus far therefore they were allowed to be of the Clergy, and upon this Foot many Churches and Councils accepted them upon their Return, as I have shewed elsewhere¹, and permitted them to continue in their Offices without a Reordination. And when, in the Discipline of the Church, it was thought proper to deprive them of the Power and Honour of their Places, yet, even in that Case, the Church did not intend to deny the Validity of their

¹ Origin. Eccles. Lib. 4. cap. 7. n. 7 & 8.

their Ordination, but supposed that to remain still so entire, as that if ever after the Church should recall them to those Offices, she would not do it by giving them a new Ordination, any more than a new Baptism. Which is largely insisted on by St. *Austin*^m against the *Donatists*; and St. *Jerom*ⁿ against the *Luciferians*; both which Sects pleaded for the Invalidity of Heretical Ordinations, but were refuted upon this Principle of the Catholick Church, That Baptism and Ordination, tho' sinfully given, if they be valid, are not to be wholly annulled, or afterward repeated. In this Sense Hereticks and Schismatics and Degraded Priests were allowed to be Priests still, and their Acts to be Valid, tho' done Irregularly, Sinfully, and Unlawfully, against the Rule and Authority of the Church, to their own Destruction.

But then, on the other hand, if by Priests be meant only Presbyters acting by the just and lawful Authority of their Bishop, in due Subordination to him, and in the Unity of the Church, and according to the Catholick Laws and Rules thereof; so as when either they desert the Communion of the Church, or are justly Degraded for their Crimes, they can no longer be said to act by her lawful Authority, but in manifest Contempt and Opposition to her Rules: And if by Laymen are meant, all those who by the Discipline and just Censures of the Church are degraded

^m Aug. cont. Parmen. Lib. 2. cap. 13. Si visum est opus esse ut eadem Officia gererent, quæ gerebant, non sunt rursus ordinati, sed sicut Baptismus in eis, ita Ordinatio mansit integra. --- Ac cum expedire hoc judicatur Ecclesiæ, ut Præpositi eorum venientes ad Catholicam societatem, Honores suos ibi non administrent; non eis tamen ipsa Ordinationis Sacramenta detrahuntur, sed manent super eos.

ⁿ Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucifer.

degraded from their Clerical Offices, and reduced to the State of Lay-Communion: In this sense the Ancients would not allow Hereticks and Schismatics to be of the Clergy, but censured them as Men out of Office; or, as Anti-Episcopal Usurpers, who set up another Altar against their Bishop; and esteem'd their Acts as much unauthorized, sinful, and irregular, as those of any unauthorized Laymen; nay, and esteemed them in some sense Laymen too, when once they were formally Degraded, and reduc'd to the Communion of Laymen: which was making them Laymen as much as was in the Church's Power to do it, by divesting them of their Offices, and withdrawing all Legal Authority to execute such Offices from them, and so leaving them in an unauthorized State of Anti-episcopal Usurpation. The Church indeed did not pretend wholly to cancel or annul their Ordination, or give them a new Ordination, when She authorized them to officiate again: But she could and did, by her Discipline and Censures, deprive them of the Execution of her Sacred Offices, and reduce them in all other respects to the Quality of Laymen; and then if they acted in that State, it was not by her Authority, but as Usurpers and Invaders. So that the Answer to the Question proposed, we see, depends entirely upon these Distinctions: As they had an Ordination that could not be wholly disannulled, they were in some measure intitled to the Name and Character of Clerks; but as they were divested of all Lawful Authority to execute any Sacred Office, they were in the State and Capacity of Laymen; and so, upon different accounts, as it were, in a sort of middle state betwixt both.

Upon

Upon the whole Matter, the Result of our Enquiry concerning Hereticks, and Schismaticks, and Degraded Clergymen is this : 1. They all act in opposition to the Church's Lawful Authority, and therefore have not her Lawful Authority to baptize. 2. Notwithstanding this, their Baptisms, if done in due Form, are valid, and not to be repeated. Yet, 3. those Baptisms have great Deficiencies, particularly that they do not minister Remission of Sins, and other Invisible Graces of the Holy Spirit, except where it pleases God to supply them in extraordinary Mercy, and in an extraordinary Way, to Infants, or others who are baptized by Hereticks in Cases of Necessity, for want of other Lawful Ministers : Which Deficiencies are to be supplied by Imposition of Hands, and Invocation of the Holy Spirit, upon their Repentance and Return to the Catholick Church. And this whether Hereticks, acting in that Capacity, be considered, 4^{thly}, either as Clergymen or Laymen, or in a middle State betwixt both : For whatever Capacity they act in, their Baptisms are not properly the Legal and Authorized Baptisms of the Church, and therefore have need of some subsequent Authority to confirm them. This is the Sum of the Doctrine of the Ancients, concerning the Baptism of Hereticks and their Reception into the Church.

If it be enquired now, How the Reformed Church of *England* comes to have full and ample Authority to baptize, which before was an Heretical and Schismatical Church, under the slavery of the Romish Yoke?

I answer, By shaking off that Yoke, and Re-forming

§. 23.

How the Church of England comes to have Authority to baptize, tho' she had her Baptism only from the Heretical Church of Rome.

forming her Errors, and Returning to the Unity of the Catholick Church. Which was the ancient Method for Schismatical and Heretical Bishops, and other Clergy, to gain that Lawful Authority that empower'd them to officiate Legally, which they had not, nor could not have, whilst they continued in their Errors, and out of the Unity of the Holy Catholick Church. Thus the great Council of *Nice* decreed, in the Case of the *Novatians*, ' That upon their Return to the Church^o ' they should continue in the same Station and ' Clerical Degrees they were in before, only receiving a Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands, by ' way of Absolution. And by vertue of this they had now the full Power and License of the Church to authorize them to officiate, which they certainly had not before. And this was the Case of the *Donatists* in the Time of *St. Austin*, as appears from the Writings of that Father, and several Canons in the *African* Code, of which I have given a particular Account in another place ^p. The same Rule and Method then which was used and allowed in the Primitive Church, was that which authorized the English Bishops and Priests to officiate Legally upon their Reforming from their Heretical and Schismatical Errors and Corruptions, and Returning to the strict and perfect Unity of the Holy Catholick Church. And so those Persons, who could only give valid Baptism before, as Hereticks and Schismatics may do by a kind of Usurpation, were now qualified authoritatively to give it every way Legal, Perfect, and Authentick.

But

^o Conc. Nic. can. 8.

^p Origin. Eccles. Lib 4. cap. 7. n. 7 & 8.

But some will be ready to ask, Where was that Holy Catholick Church, to which our first Reformers are supposed to return? Which is much such another Question as that other, Where was your Church before *Luther*? To which I answer, It was where the Holy Catholick Faith and Doctrine of the Creed and Scriptures was maintained, without the Addition of the Romish Errors and Corruptions: And tho' there had been no visible Professors of that Faith and Doctrine entirely pure, yet it had been sufficient for the first Reformers to have returned to the Profession of the Faith itself; which, in effect, is returning to the Unity of the Holy Catholick Church, the chief and principal part of whose Unity is the sincere Faith of the Creed and Scriptures. But we can shew also where there were visible Professors of this Faith in every Age perhaps, who always opposed the Corruptions of the Romish Church, and kept themselves free from her Heretical Stains and Pollutions. And why might not our first Reformers, by joining themselves to the Faith and Communion of those Visible Professors, be said to return to the Unity of the Holy Catholick Church in the strictest and most perfect Notion of the Unity thereof? Some of those noble Professors were the *Waldenses* or the *Albigenses*, and the *Fratres Bohemi*, whose History is so famous in latter Ages. And many worthy Writers have deserved excellently of the Church of God, who have endeavoured to preserve their Memory, and Writings, and Confessions of Faith, as standing Monuments and lasting Evidences of their Religion; and also to clear their Character of the black and odious Imputations, which their Adversaries have falsely and industriously thrown upon them. Such are the learned Labours of Archbishop *Usher*, and Sir *Samuel Morland*, and Dr. *Allix*

Allix among ourselves, and those of the Learned *Albertinus*, and *Joachim Hesterberg*; but especially the great Treasuries and Collections of Mr. *Paul Perrin* and *Balthasar Lydius*, with the Golden History of the Persecutions of the Church of *Bohemia*, in most of which we may find their Doctrines and Principles to be the same with those of the Reformation. Here were vast numbers of Catholick and Visible Professors, as the Reader may easily judge by this one Observation, which Dr. *Crakanthorp* ^q long ago made out of *Bzovius* his Annals, ' That there were no less than an Hundred and ' forty two thousand nine hundred and ninety of ' the *Albigenses* miserably slaughter'd in one Age, ' in the one Kingdom of *France*, within the space of ' Threescore Years. And then, as he says, who ' can enumerate, or even but conceive in his ' Mind, what Myriads of Myriads in all other ' Parts of *Europe*, for the space of Four hundred ' Years and more, from the time of Pope *Hildebrand*, ' were devoured with Fire and Sword, by the Beast ' which is drunk with the Blood of the Saints? Or ' who can speak of these things without weeping? ' If there were so many Martyrs, the whole Pro- ' duct of the Church was certainly much greater: ' For the Blood of the Martyrs always makes an ' Increase. , So then, without farther Enquiry, there were numbers enough of Catholick Professors for the Church of *England* to join with at the Reformation from her former Errors and Heresies of *Rome*. And that nothing might seem to be wanting, these were Episcopal Churches too, and great care was always taken to preserve Episcopacy among

^q Crakanthorp. Defens. Eccles. Angl. cont. Spalat. Cap. 18. p. 101.

among them. *Spondanus* himself ^r tells us, the *Albigenses* were once so powerful in *France*, as to think of setting up one of their Bishops as a General Patriarch of their Order, against the Pope, and that *Bartholomæus* of *Carcasson* was his Substitute in the *French* Dominions. And that they had Bishops among them, is otherwise evident from the History of the Persecutions of the *Bohemian* Church, supposed to be written by *Comenius*, a Bishop of the *Bohemians* in the last Age, who tells us a remarkable Story, ‘How the *Bohemians* being in some
 ‘Distress for want of Bishops, sent three of their
 ‘Ministers, *Matthias Kunwaldius*, *Thomas Prelaucius*,
 ‘and *Elias Krzenovius*, to the *Waldenses*, dispersed
 ‘throughout *Austria* and *Moravia*, to have them
 ‘ordained Bishops; which was accordingly done
 ‘by *Stephen* and another Bishop of the *Waldenses*,
 ‘with some Presbyters joined with them: These
 ‘three were ordained Bishops by them and sent
 ‘back ^f to *Bohemia* again: And from thence came
 ‘the Succession of Catholick Bishops in *Bohemia*,
 ‘which continued to the final Extirpation of them
 ‘in the last Age, by the ill Success of the *Bohemian* War, and the Prevalency of the Popish
 ‘Faction. These are most undeniable Proofs, that the *Waldenses* or *Albigenses* had always Bishops among them; and they did not derive their Authority from the Pope, but had it originally among themselves, handed down from the time of *Constantine*, as they themselves declared to the
 Bohemi-

^r *Spondan.* an. 1223. n. 7.

^f *Histor. Persec. Eccles. Bohem.* c. 20. p. 71. Quinimo tribus illis Ministros creandi potestate collata, manuum Impositione eos Episcopos creant, & ad suos remittunt.

Bohemians^t, when they ordained their Ministers Bishops in the forementioned Congress. And this agrees exactly with the Account, which even *Rainerius*, a Popish Writer, but something more Ingenuous than the common Railers of that Party gives of them. ‘ Among all the Sects, says he, ‘ that are, or ever were, there is not a more pernicious one to the Church of God, than that of ‘ the poor Men of *Lyons*; and that for three Reasons: 1. Because it was more ancient; for some ‘ said it had continued from the Time of ^u Pope ‘ *Sylvester*, and others from the Time of the ‘ Apostles. 2. Because it was more universal; for ‘ there was no Nation almost, where this Sect had ‘ not some footing. 3. Because all other Sects ‘ were accompanied with horrible Blasphemies against God, which would make a Man tremble; ‘ but this of the *Leonists* had a great shew of Piety: ‘ They lived uprightly before Men, and believed ‘ all things aright of God, and all the Articles ‘ contained in the Creed. Only they blasphemed ‘ and hated the Church of *Rome*. These were those ancient, numerous, and pious Members of the Catholick Church, governed by a College of Catholick Bishops, from the Time of *Constantine*, and so from the Time of the Apostles, with whom the Church of *England* had to join in Communion at the time of her Reformation from the Errors

^t Ibid. Inveniunt illi Episcopum eorum Stephanum: qui accito Episcopo altero, & aliquot è Ministris, Originem suam usque à Constantini temporibus, Doctrinæ item suæ Articulos, & quid hætenus horrendi per Italiam & Galliam passi essent, explicant.

^u Rainer. cont. Waldenses. c. 4. Cited by Crakanthorp. Cont. Spalat. c. 18. p. 100. & in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 4. Par. 2. p. 749. Aliqui dicunt, quod duraverit hæc Secta à tempore Sylvestri; aliqui à tempore Apostolorum, &c.

Errors and Heresies of Popery. Which being so, I cannot but stand amazed at the Attempt of Mr. Collier, and wonder at his Design in his late History of the Church of *England*, where he goes about Industriously and Partially to represent the black Part^w of the Character of the *Albigenses*, from the Calumnies and Slanders of their Adversaries, without suggesting the least Tittle of what so many Learned Men have said, or what may be said, in their Vindication. This was not acting fairly the Part of an Historian, much less the Part of a Friend to the Church of *England*, to rob her of the Testimony and Confession of so considerable a Body of worthy Patriots and Martyrs, in whose Communion (as I have shewed) she had so particular an Interest in almost all the Steps and Measures of her Reformation. And now that I have said this, I cannot but note one thing more in this Author, which looks not well in a Protestant Writer; that is, his Account of the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* (in his late Supplement to the *Historical Dictionary*) both which are taken from the History of *Maimbourg* their profest Enemy. When yet he could not be ignorant what an excellent Vindication of the *Lutherans* had been written against *Maimbourg*, by the Noble and Learned *Seckendorf*; to which he refers his Reader upon some other Occasions; which shews, that he was no Stranger to it. But this only by the way. I now return to the History of the ancient Church.

H

The

^w Collier. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 5. p. 388, &c.

§. 24.
Of the Baptism of
Turks, Jews, and
Infidels.

The last Question is concerning the Baptism of such as are wholly out of the Church, and in no sense Christians, such as *Turks, Jews, and Infidels*: Whether Baptism administered by any of these, in the Form of the Church, be to be reputed Valid as well as others? I had not mentioned this Question, but only because the Church of *Rome* has carried the Matter so far as to affirm it, contrary to the Judgment and Practice of all the ancient Church: For in her *Ritual* ^x of Baptism she has this Rubrick or Direction, 'That tho' the Ordinary Minister of Baptism be only a Priest or a Deacon; yet, in case of Necessity, it may be done not only by a Layman or Woman, that is a Catholick, but by a *Jew*, a *Pagan*, or an *Infidel*., And so Pope *Nicholas* ^y in the Canon Law, and *Eugenius* in the Council ^z of *Florence* magisterially determined. But this is one of the Novelties of Popery; for the Ancients spake in another Stile. *St. Jerom* ^a professes himself amazed to hear a *Luciferian* say, A Man might be made a Christian by one who himself was in no sense a Christian; which the *Luciferians* were forced to assert upon their Principles, who receiv'd the Baptism of the *Arians*, and yet maintain'd that they were mere *Pagans* who administered it: which *St. Jerom* justly exposes as a strange Para-

x *Rituale Roman.* Titul. de Ministro Baptismi. p. 15.

y *Nichol. Respons.* ad Consulta Bulgaror. c. 104. ap. *Gratian.* de Consecrat. Dist. 4. c. 24.

z *Eugen. Decret.* ad Armenos. Conc. Tom. 13. p. 535. In causa necessitatis non solum sacerdos vel Diaconus, sed etiam Laicus vel Mulier, imo etiam Paganus & Hæreticus baptizare potest, dummodo Formam servet Ecclesiæ.

a *Hieron. Dial.* adv. Lucifer. c. 5. Novam rem asseris, ut Christianus quisquam factus sit ab eo qui non fuit Christianus.

Paradox in Christianity, that Christian Baptism might be given by Men who themselves were no Christians. And this shews the true state of the Controversy between St. *Ferom* and the *Luciferians*: It was not, Whether Laymen might Baptize in case of Necessity, as some have imagined; for upon this Point both Sides were agreed: But it was, 1st, Whether the *Arian* Priests were meer Heathens? Which the *Luciferians* affirmed, and St. *Ferom* denied. And then, 2^{dly}, Whether supposing them to be meer Heathens, as the *Luciferians* would have it, their Baptism was valid, and ought not to be repeated again? The *Luciferians* asserted it to be valid, notwithstanding the Supposition of their being Heathens: But St. *Ferom* refutes their Assertion upon this Principle, That none but a Christian could give Christian Baptism: And therefore the *Luciferians* ought either to own, as the *Catholicks* did, that the *Arians* were in some sense *Christians*, and not meer *Pagans*; or else to rebaptize those that were baptized by them, since *Pagans* could have no manner of Power to give *Christian* Baptism. *Tertullian*, and the Council of *Eliberis* were of the same Opinion: For they only plead for the Validity of such Baptisms as were administered by *Christians*. And St. *Austin* says, ^b it was a very different Question from that of Lay-Baptism, and that nothing ought to be determined in Favour of it, without the Authority of a General Council. *Nicephorus*, among the *Greeks*, ^c declares positively, 'That no Man can baptize others, who is not first baptized himself as a *Christian*.' And Pope

H 2

Gre-

^b Aug. cont. Parmen. Lib. 2. c. 13. It. de Bapt. Lib. 7. c. 53.

^c Niceph. Hist. Lib. 11. c. 11.

Gregory III. is alledg'd by some for the same Opinion. So that the Determination of the *Romish* Church, for the Validity of Baptism administred by *Jews* and *Pagans*, is wholly new, and utterly without Precedent in the Primitive Church. The Author of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* and *Ado Viennensis* indeed give an Instance or two of Persons who were baptized by Heathens, in Mockery, upon the Stage, who are also said to have been Converted, and suffered Martyrdom upon it: But these Effects were owing to the miraculous Grace of God, and not to any such Baptism; and therefore these Instances may serve to prove the Power of Martyrdom, which may save Men without Baptism; but are of no weight to justify the modern Practice.

I have now gone through the several Questions at first proposed, so far as relates to the Judgment and Practice of the Primitive Church.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Practice of the Modern Greeks and Moscovites.

PROCEED we now to en-
quire into the Sense and
Practice of the Church in latter
Ages. And here I shall say no-
thing more of the *Western* or *Latin* Church, because
its Practice is so generally known and uncontested.
In the *Greek* Church there has been some Dispute
about this Matter, and some seeming Variation in
the Decrees of their Councils, tho' they have
more generally agreed with the *Latins* so far, as to
allow the Baptism of Laymen in Cases of extreme
Necessity; which is now also their common Pra-
ctice. In the time of the Patriarch *Nicephorus*,
commonly called the Confessor, who lived in the
beginning of the Ninth Century, about Fifty
Years before *Photius*, it was Synodically determi-
ned to be lawful. For in *Harmenopulus* Epitome
of the Canons, and the Collection of Synodical
Decrees of the *Greek* Patriarchs published by *Le-*
unclavius in his *Jus Græco-Romanum*, there are two
Canons of *Nicephorus* to this purpose. In one of
which^d it is said, 'That if there happen to be In-
'fants found in a place where there is no Priest,
H 3 'they

§. I.
*The Practice of
the modern Greek
Church.*

^d Ap. Leunclav. Jus Gr. Rom. Lib. 3. p. 196. Χρὴ τὰ
ἐκείνην νῆμα, εἰς ἐπεὶ τὴν τὴν τοῦτον, μὴ ὄντος ἱερέως,
βαπτισθῆναι. Εἰ βαπτισθῇ δὲ ὁ ἰδίῳ πατρὶ, ἢ ὀίῳ δυνάμει
ἀνθρώπου, μόνον ἵνα ὅτι χριστιανὸς, ἐκ ἑστὶν ἀμαρτία.

‘ they ought to be baptized : And if in that Case
 ‘ the Father baptizes his own Child, or any other
 ‘ Man, provided only that he be a Christian, it is
 ‘ no Sin. , In the other Canon^e he says, ‘ In
 ‘ Case of Necessity a simple Monk, that is, one
 ‘ who is no Priest, may baptize. As also a Dea-
 ‘ con, and a Layman, if it be in a place where
 ‘ there is no Priest. , And thus Matters seem to
 have stood also in the time of *Photius*, who, among
 all the Objections that he raises against the *Roman*
 Church, in his famous Encyclical Epistle, never so
 much as touches upon this Point; which probably
 he would have done, had there then been any dif-
 ference between them. Yet some private Writers,
 about this time, began to dispute the Legality of
 Lay-Baptism, and call in Question the Church’s
 Practice. *Georgius Hamartolus*, a Chronographer not
 yet extant in Print, about the Year 840, made a
 bitter Invective against it; for the knowledge of
 which we are beholden to the curious Industry of
Cotelerius, who has publish’d a Fragment^f out of
 that Writer relating to this Subject. He tells us,
 that Author having occasion to mention the Case
 of the *Jew* that was baptized in Sand, makes this
 Reflection on it: ‘ Where now are those who say,
 ‘ that Laymen and Women may baptize sometimes
 ‘ in Cases of Necessity; and that contend, thro’
 ‘ Ignorance and prodigious and perversicacious Impi-
 ‘ ety, that such Baptism ought to be reputed as
 ‘ Perfect and Divine? Who pay no regard to the
 Doctrine

^e Ap. Harmenopol. Epitom. Canon. Sect. 4. Tit. 2. p. 44.
 Κατὰ πείρασιν καὶ μοναχὸς λιτὸς βαπτίζει. αὐτὸς καὶ
 διάκονος. καὶ λαϊκὸς δέ, εἰ ἐν ἐκτάτῃ εἰς τόπον, μὴ ὄντι
 ἱερέως.

^f Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 9.

‘ Doctrine and Command of the Apostles (meaning the Book which goes under the Name of the *Apostolical Constitutions*) which says, ‘ We do
 ‘ not permit a Layman to perform any Sacerdotal
 ‘ Office, as the Oblation of the Eucharist, or Baptism, or Imposition of Hands, or the greater
 ‘ or the lesser Benediction. For no one takes to
 ‘ himself this Honour, but he that is called of
 ‘ GOD. For this Dignity or Authority is given
 ‘ by the Imposition of Hands of the Bishop: But
 ‘ he that assumes this Power as an Usurper and Invader, will incur the Crime and become liable
 ‘ to the Punishment of *Saul* and *Ozias*. Nor do
 ‘ we only prohibit Laymen, but the rest of the
 ‘ Clergy to confer Baptism, as Deacons, Readers, Singers and Subdeacons; allowing it only to
 ‘ Bishops and Presbyters, who are to have the
 ‘ Deacons attend upon them. And they who presume to do otherwise, shall suffer the Punishment of *Corah* and his Company. It is therefore
 ‘ vain cavilling, *says our Author*, or rather Fighting against GOD, to speak more truly, in such
 ‘ as confer the Gifts and Operations of the Priesthood upon Laymen and Women, to the Subversion of their Hearers, who lend an Ear to the
 ‘ vain and empty Discourses of Men, who know not what the Priesthood means, or what difference there is between a Priest and a Layman. ,,
 This Writer seems either not to have known the forementioned Decrees of *Nicephorus*, or else to
 condemn and insult them. For he sets himself wholly to oppose both the Doctrine and Practice authorized by them, and argues as much against the Validity of Baptism when ministred by Deacons in Cases of Necessity, as by Laymen. Yet notwithstanding his Opposition, these Canons continued in force among the *Greeks* for some
 H 4 Ages

Ages after. For *Harmenopulus*, who lived in the middle of the Twelfth Century, and wrote his Epitome of the *Greek Canons* about the Year 1150, has inserted them both into his Collection: And they are the only Canons that are mentioned upon this Subject; which seems to argue, that they were then the standing Rule of the *Greek Church*. Yet there were some who made Opposition to them in this Age also: For *Michael Glycas*, who wrote his Annals about the Year 1120, takes occasion to urge several Arguments against the Validity of Lay-Baptism in any Cases of Necessity whatsoever. But as *Cotelerius* ^g has observed, his Arguments are grounded upon several Mistakes in Matters of Fact, which makes them weak and inconclusive: First he urges the ^h Example of *Dionysius*, Bishop of *Ascalon*, who is said to have Re-baptized a Man, who had been Baptized in Sand, instead of Water, by a Layman. But here wanted an essential Part of Baptism, *viz.* the Element of Water, which seems to have been the true Reason why the Party was Re-baptized, if the whole Story be not a Fiction. In the next place, he alledges the Authority of the Apostolical Canons, prohibiting Laymen to meddle with the Priest's Office, whatever Cases of Necessity may seem to require it. And yet the Case of Necessity is never so much as once mentioned in all the Apostolical Canons or Constitutions: Only Laymen are severely prohibited, in general, from thrusting themselves into the Offices of the Ecclesiastical Function. *Thirdly*, He argues from the Authority of *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, who, he says,

^g Coteler. Not. in Const. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 9.

^h Glycas Annal. p. 243.

says, Rebaptized the Children that had been Baptized by *Athanasius*. But this is directly contrary to all the old Historians, *Socrates*, *Sozomen* and *Ruffin*, who say expressly that *Alexander* did not Rebaptize them, but only added what was wanting, and what belonged to the Episcopal Office to perform, that is, Imposition of the Bishop's Hands, with the Uction or Chrism of Confirmation. And so the Author of the Life of *Athanasius*, in *Photius* ⁱ, is to be understood, when he says, 'That *Alexander* gave them the Uction, and 'perfected them by the Seal or Consignation of 'CHRIST: Which *Glycas* mistook for the Seal of Baptism, instead of Confirmation, being led into that Error by some modern *Biographer*, who understood not the truth of the Story, nor the ancient Language of the Church, in which the Word *σφραγίς* signifies not only the Seal of Baptism, but that of Confirmation also. About an Hundred Years after *Glycas* lived one *Theodorus Scutariota*, who wrote some *Scholia* or Annotations upon *Nicetas Choniates* his *Thesaurus Orthodoxæ Fidei*, where he also maintains the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, as *Cotelerius* ^k informs us, who had seen the Manuscript: For the Work itself was never yet made Publick. But all these were but Private Writers hitherto, and therefore signify little to oppose their own private Opinions to the declared Sense of the Church, as it was Authentically delivered in the Canons of *Nicephorus*, made in a Patriarchal Council, where 270 Bishops were present, if the Council of *Constantinople*, An. 814. was the Council in which those Canons were made. That which seems

ⁱ Phot. Cod. 258. Τέρας ἐπιχρίσας, διὰ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ σφραγίδος ἐπλείωσεν.

^k Coteler. Not. in Const. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 9.

seems to carry more weight with it, to bear down the 'forefaid' Authority, is another Decree made in the Council of *Constantinople*, under *Lucas Chrysoberges* the Patriarch, *An. 1166*. Here the Question was put by *Manuel* Archbishop of *Heraclea*, Whether a Man ought to be received as a Christian, who was baptized by one who pretended to be a Priest, but was not so? For such a Case had lately happen'd in his Diocese¹. In answer to this the Synod decreed, That such ought to be rebaptized; because the Administration of Baptism is only committed to Bishops and Priests, according to the 46 and 47 Canons of the Apostles. This Council cannot be denied to speak plainly against the Validity of Lay-Baptism, and in favour of Rebaptization, in the Case that was then laid before them; which was the Ordinary Ministration of Baptism by such as counterfeited Orders, and pretended to be Priests when they were not so. But whether they intended by this wholly to invalidate the Baptism of Deacons and Laymen in Extraordinary Cases of absolute Necessity, when neither a Bishop nor Presbyter can be had; as they have not expressed themselves particularly upon this Point, so it is more than I can pretend positively, from their words, to determine. But if it was so, then I can say, it was plainly contrary to the Decrees of the former Council under *Nicephorus*, which prevailed in Practice both before and since this Council, and still does in the *Greek Church* to this Day, however some Learned Persons, for want of a little better enquiry, have suffered themselves to be led into an Error in thinking

¹ Conc. Constantinopol. ap. Mat. Blastar. Syntagm. Canon. in Bevereg. Pandect. Tom. 2. p. 42.

ing otherwise: For the best *Greek* Writers of late Days, in speaking of the Minister of Baptism, and the Practice of their Church, always except the Case of extreme Necessity, in which they allow a Lay-Man or Woman to baptize, rather than suffer a Child to die without Baptism. Nothing can be plainer than the Answer which *Jeremy*, the late Patriarch of *Constantinople*, gave to the Divines of *Tubing*, *Jacobus Andreas* and *Martin Crusius*, in the last Age, when they had sent him the *Ausbourg* Confession, and desir'd his Sentiments about it. In the Point of ministring Baptism he thus expresses himself, according to *Socolovius's* Translation: 'The Instrumental Cause of Baptism is a Priest; unless a sudden Necessity require it to be otherwise; in which Case^m Baptism conferred by one that is not a Priest is valid. ,,' *Hottinger* takes notice of the same Answer, and gives us his wordsⁿ from the Original, which are, 'That when a Case of Necessity happens, they esteem it lawful for Laymen to Baptize. ,,' And *Hottin-*ger observes farther, That tho' the Patriarch expressed his dissent from the *Lutheran* Divines, in some other Points, yet upon this Head, and many others, there was a perfect Agreement between them: For the *Lutheran* Churches, as we shall see more hereafter, are all for the Validity of Baptism, when administred in Cases of Necessity by Laymen. As to the Practice of the present *Greek* Church, we have farther Evidence from what

Swice-

^m *Jërem. Epist. ad Germanos ap. Socolov. Censur. Ecclesiæ Oriental. c. 7. p. 111. Instrumentalis Causa sacerdos est; nisi quid aliud præceptis necessitas exposcat: Nam & tum ab alio quam à sacerdote collatus Baptismus vim suam retinet.*

ⁿ *Id. ap. Hottinger. Hist. Eccles. Sæcul. 16. p. 58. 'Ανάγκης μὴ τὴν ὁρμησάντος, καὶ τοῖς λαοῖς βαπτίζειν ἔχειν.*

Suicerus ^o has observed out of *Metrophanes Critopulus*, a late Writer of that Communion, who wrote the Confession of the Oriental Church, where he thus expresses himself concerning Baptism ^p in such Cases: ‘When a pressing Necessity requires, the Infant is Baptized immediately after its Birth: And if a Presbyter be not at hand, the Midwife does it. If the Child recover, this Baptism is reckon’d sufficient for him.’, *Arcudius* has the like ^q Remark, out of *Gabriel Severus*, Archbishop of *Philadelphia*, in his Book of the Sacraments ^r of the Church, where he says, ‘That when a Priest cannot be present, a Lay-Christian, Man or Woman, may baptize.’, And the Learned *Dr. Smith*, who has lately written of the present State of the *Greek Church*, gives us this Account of their Practice from one of their publick Confessions of Faith, written in the *Vulgar Greek*, and printed in the Year 1662, where it is expressly ^s said, ‘That it is not lawful and proper for any one to baptize, but a Lawful Priest, except in time of Necessity; and then a Secular Person, whether Man or Woman, may do it.’, So that what *Bishop Taylor*, in his *Ductor Dubitantium* ^t, has alledged out of *Simeon*, Archbishop of *Thessalonica*, decla-

^o *Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. Tom. 1. p. 632.*

^p *Metrophan. Critopul. Confess. Eccles. Orient. c. 7. p. 87.*
 Ἀνάγκης δὲ κατεπειγούσης, εὐθὺς, μετὰ τὴν γέννησιν βαπτίζε-
 ται τὸ γυννηθέν. καὶν πρεσβύτερος μὴ παύσιν, ἢ μοῖα τέτο
 ποιεῖ. ----- Εἰ δὲ τὸ βρέφος ἀναρρώσῃ, ἀρκυθήσεται τέτω
 τῷ βαπτίσματι.

^q *Arcud. de Concord. Eccles. Orient. & Occid. Lib. 1. c. 11. p. 34.*

^r *Gabriel Sever. de Sacramentis Cap. de Baptismo. Μὴ παρόντος ἱερέως, δύναται βαπτίζειν καὶ λαϊκὸς χριστιανὸς, ἄντε γυνή, ἄντε ἄρρεν.*

^s *Smith's Account of the Greek Church, p. 110.*

^t *Taylor Duct. Dubit. Lib. 3. c. 4. Rule, 15. p. 638.*

declaring, ' That no Man baptizes but he that is
' in Holy Orders,, is either to be understood in
the same manner, with the Limitation and Ex-
ception of the time of Necessity, or else to be
rejected as false; since there are so many plain
undeniable Evidences of their Practice to the con-
trary, that he must outface the Sun at Noonday,
that will pretend to withstand them. This An-
swer was given by *Arcudius*^u to this Passage of
Simeon, long before Bishop *Taylor* wrote, but they
neither of them refer us to *Simeon's* Book, whence
it is taken: I suppose it to be his Book of the Sa-
craments of the Church, whence, *Socolovius* says,
the Patriarch *Jeremy* took his Account of Baptism:
and, if so, it is more than probable they were of
the same Mind in this Matter. But till I can see
the Book itself, I will not be Positive, but rest
satisfied with the Answer given by *Arcudius*, as
a just Reply to this Exception.

The *Moscovites* commonly fol-
low the Practice of the *Greeks*,
as having been first converted
to Christianity by them, and
still continuing to be of their Communion and
Religion. Whence one might probably conclude,
that their Sentiments and Practice, in this Point,
were agreeable to those of the *Greek Church*,
tho' there were no farther Evidence for it. But
their Rules and Canons give particular Orders
about this Matter, as the Learned *Gerhard*, who
was acquainted with them, assures us; for he says,
The

§. 2.
*The Practice of the
Moscovites.*

^u *Arcud. de Concord. Eccles. Orient. & Occid. Lib. I. c. II. p. 28.*

The first Canon ^w of *John*, their Metropolitan, who is commonly called their Prophet, gives this Direction, 'That Children, in case of Necessity, should be baptized without a Priest. The People indeed do not always observe this Rule: For some Authors tell us ^x, many of them think a Priest so absolutely requisite to perform this Office, that whatever Case of Necessity happen, they will not permit it to be done by any other but a Priest. But we are to judge of the Sense and Practice of a Church, from the Rules and Canons made by its Governors, and not by the Practice of the Vulgar, who often transgress their Rules either through Ignorance, Neglect, or Contempt; in which Case it would be injurious to any Church to judge of her Doctrines by the contrary Practice of the common People.

^w Gerhard. Loc. Commun. Tom. 4. de Baptismo. n. 37. p. 242. Primus Canon Johannis Metropolitæ eorum dicti Prophetæ, pueros quoque jubet in necessitate absque Sacerdote baptizari. p. 24.

^x Joh. Fabri de Relig. Moscov. p. 176. Huic muneri fungendo, quæcunque necessitas inciderit, nemo hominum sufficere putatur, nisi sacerdos extiterit.

C H A P. III.

The Practice of the Churches of the Reformation.

NEXT for the Churches of the Reformation. The §. I.
The Practice of the Lutherans.
Lutherans in all Nations allow of the Baptism of Lay-Persons, Men and Women, in Cases of absolute Necessity. We have heard before out of *Hottinger*, that the *German* Divines of *Tubing*, who were *Luther's* Disciples, and of the *Ausburgh* Confession, agreed perfectly upon this Head with the *Greek* Church. And it is farther evident from the Works of the most celebrated Writers of that Way both in *Germany* and *Denmark*. Some of their Professors have particular Dissertations upon this Subject, where they both assert the Grounds of their own Churches Practice, and reply to all the Objections that are made to the contrary. It will be sufficient to refer the Reader to two of them at present, *Brochmand* and *Gerhard*, whereof the one was Professor of Divinity at *Copenhagen* in *Denmark*, and the other at *Jene* in *Saxony*. *Brochmand* in his Body of Divinity ^a lays down this Assertion as the Doctrine and Rule of the Church: 'That any Person who is a Christian, ' Man or Woman, may be the Extraordinary Minister

^a *Brochmand. System. Theolog. Tom. 2. de Baptismo Cap. 5. Sect. 3. p. 418. Extraordinarius Baptismi Administer, saltem in extremo necessitatis casu, ubi præsentissima mors imminet, & verbi Minister haberi non potest, quivis homo Christianus esse potest, sive sit Mas sive Fæmina.*

' nister of Baptism, at least in the Case of ex-
 ' treme Necessity, when there is imminent dan-
 ' ger of Death, and a Minister of the Word can-
 ' not be had. ,, He considers four of the Princi-
 pal Objections to the contrary, and gives them
 these short ^b Answers. Object. 1. That the Ad-
 ministration of the Sacraments is part of the Ec-
 clesiastical Ministry, *Matt. xxviii. 19. Mar. xvi. 15.*
 Object. 2. That it is not permitted to a Woman to
 Teach in the Church, *1 Tim. ii. 12.* To these two
 Objections he returns the same Answer, ' That in
 ' Case of extreme Necessity every Private Person
 ' is permitted to Teach and Administer Baptism. ,,
 For he supposes those Rules to relate only to the
 Publick and Standing Ministry in ordinary Cases.
 To a 3^d Objection, That no Private Person is au-
 thorized to Administer the Lord's Supper: He re-
 plys, ' That there is not commonly the same ex-
 ' treme Necessity in the one as the other, and that
 ' makes some Disparity between Baptism and the
 ' Lord's Supper. ,, To the last Objection, That
 Womens Baptism was introduced first by *Marcion*
 the Heretick: He answers, ' That the *Marcionites*
 ' granted a promiscuous Liberty to any Persons to
 ' baptize in any Case, which their Churches did
 ' by no means approve or allow. ,, *Gerhard* is more
 copious upon this Subject: First he lays down
^c their Doctrine in this Assertion, ' That tho' the
 ' Admi-

^b Ibid. Cap. 6. p. 432.

^c Gerhard. Loc. Commun. de Bapt. n. 33. Tom. 4. p. 239.
 Quamvis Baptismi administratio Ordinarie pertineat ad Ecclesiæ
 ministros; Extraordinarie tamen in extremo necessitatis casu,
 quando hoc immediatum disjunctum obtinet, aut Infantulo ab-
 sique baptismo moriendum, aut baptismus à Privata Persona ei
 conferendus, in hoc inquam necessitatis casu, privatis in ædibus
 à quovis Christiano in Articulis Religionis recte instituto, citra
 sexus respectum, baptismum administrari posse statuimus.

Administration of Baptism ordinarily belongs to
 the Ministers of the Church ; yet, in Extraor-
 dinary Cases of extreme Necessity, when one
 of these two things must needs be, that either
 an Infant must die without Baptism, or else Bap-
 tism must be conferred upon it by a Private Per-
 son ; in such an Exigency, they hold that Bap-
 tism may be administred in a Private House, by
 any Christian that is rightly instructed in the Ar-
 ticles of Religion, without distinction of Sex.,
 Then he proceeds to assign the Grounds of this
 Assertion, where he argues first upon the Necess-
 sity of Baptism, from the Words of our Saviour,
Except a Man be born again of Water and the Spirit,
he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God ; and urges,
 That this Necessity is not in respect of God, who
 is not so tied to the Sacrament that he cannot re-
 generate without it ; but in respect of us, upon
 whom there lies a necessity of observing the Di-
 vine Command, about administering Baptism,
 wheresoever the substantial Parts of it may be
 had, lest, as much as in us lies, we hinder an In-
 fant from the ordinary Means of Salvation. A
 Publick Minister of the Church is not of the
 Essence of the Sacrament, but a Matter of Or-
 der, which is not so necessary as the Sacrament
 itself ; Order being instituted for the Sacrament,
 and not the Sacrament for Order : and therefore
 Order is to give way to the Sacrament, when
 Necessity requires. 2^{dly}, He argues from the
 parallel Case of Circumcision, which in its first
 Institution was appointed to be done by the
 Master of the Family only, *Gen. xvii. 11, 23.*
 yet in extraordinary Cases of Necessity it might
 be done by others, even by Women, as by *Zip-
 pora*, when *Moses* was so discomposed and dis-
 abled

abled, that he could not perform it; and by other Women, in the time of the *Maccabees*, 1 *Mac.* i. 63. 2 *Mac.* vi. 10. 3^{dly}, He argues farther from the parallel Case of Absolution and Teaching, which are the Ordinary Offices of the Publick Ministers: 'Yet in Extraordinary Cases, as in the time of a Siege, or a Plague, or a Persecution, when the Church is destitute of Ordinary Pastors, a Private Person may declare Absolution out of the Word of God, to a dying Man, and he may Instruct and Comfort the Sick, or others that are under any Affliction. In like manner, Private Men, in Cases of extreme Necessity, may administer Baptism; they being also a Royal Priesthood, 1 *Pet.* ii. 9. and made Kings and Priests before God, *Rev.* v. 10., I examine not now what Weight and Force there is in these Arguments, but only barely relate them as I find them in our Author, to shew what were the common Principles and Practices of the *Lutheran Churches*.

§. 2.
Of the Helvetick Churches.

Another eminent Branch of the Reformation are the *Helvetick Churches*, the Followers of *Zuinglius*, whose Doctrine upon this Point differs but little from the *Lutherans*. The Opinion of *Zuinglius* himself was altogether the same; for in his Book about Baptism^d, speaking of three several Errors that had crept in among the Circumstances of Baptism, he reckons this one of them, 'That

^d *Zuingl. de Baptismo Tom. i. p. 96.* Alter error circa Personæ circumstantiam versatur, quod baptismum à nemine alio, quàm à solo sacerdote conferri posse putarunt: cum interim quivis hominum hoc facere possit, imò Fœmina quoque, si quando necessitas sic postulare videatur.

‘ That some thought Baptism could not be conferred by any other but a Priest only ; whereas it might be given by any Man in Case of Necessity, yea, by a Woman also, if need required. But after the Death of *Zuinglius*, in the General Confession of the *Helvetick* Churches, Women were forbidden^e to baptize, because the Apostle had commanded Women not to meddle with Ecclesiastical Offices, of which Baptism was one. But still no Prohibition was laid upon Men in Cases of Necessity, nor any Order made for Rebaptizing those who were Irregularly baptized by others.

Our next Enquiry is into the Sense and Practice of the *French* and *Dutch* Churches, which in many things took their Measures from the Sentiments of *Calvin*. Now *Calvin* freely declares his Mind against the Lawfulness of Lay-baptism in any Case whatsoever. He thinks there can be no Necessity sufficient to authorize Private Men or Women to do the Office of a Publick Minister. He owns indeed that the contrary Practice had generally prevailed, not only several Ages before his own Time, but, in a manner, from the first beginning of the Church; ‘ Laymen always baptized^f in danger of Death, if a Minister

§. 3.
*Of the Calvinists,
and French, and
Dutch Churches.*

^e Confess. Helvet. c. 20. p. 70. Docemus baptismum in Ecclesia non administrari debere à mulierculis vel ab obstetricibus. Paulus enim removet mulierculas ab Ecclesiasticis Officiis. Baptismus autem pertinet ad officia Ecclesiastica.

^f Calvin. Instit. Lib. 4. c. 15. n. 20. Quod autem multis abhinc sæculis, adeoque ab ipso fere Ecclesiæ exordio, usu receptum fuit, ut in periculo mortis Laici baptizarent, si Minister in tempore non adesset, non video quam firma ratione defendi queat.

‘ nister could not be had in due time. But he thinks the Grounds they went upon were not justifiable. He does not peremptorily pronounce such Baptisms absolutely null and void, but rather the contrary : For, as Archbishop *Whitgift* long ago observed ^g, against his Adversary *Cartwright*, *Calvin* was of Opinion, ‘ That, as among Men, ‘ if an Epistle be sent, so as the Hand and Seal ‘ be known, it skilleth not who or what manner of ‘ Person carrieth it ; even so it is sufficient for us to ‘ know the Hand and Seal of the Lord in his Sacraments, by whomsoever they be delivered. Hereby is the Error of the *Donatists* confuted, who ‘ measured the Vertue and Worthiness of the Sacrament, by the Worthiness of the Minister. ‘ Such be now adays our *Anabaptists*, which deny ‘ us to be rightly baptized, because we were baptized by Wicked and Idolatrous Persons in the ‘ Pope’s Church ; and therefore they furiously ‘ urge Rebaptization. Against whose Folly we ‘ shall be sufficiently defended, if we think that ‘ we were baptized not in the Name of any Man, ‘ but in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy ‘ Ghost, and therefore Baptism not to be of Man ‘ but of GOD, by whomsoever it be ministred. This was the Judgment of *Calvin*.

However *Beza*, his Successor declares positively, not only against the Lawfulness, but the Validity of Baptism administred by private Persons, especially by Women ; which, he thinks, is no more to be regarded, than what any private Man does of his own Head in the Name of a King or a Commonwealth ; or, than a Counterfeit Seal forged by
a pri-

^g *Whitgift Defence of the Answ. to the Admonif. Tract. 9. p. 518. ex Calvin. Institut. Cap. 17. Sect. 16.*

a private Man, and set to any Instrument in imitation of the Publick. Yet he allows an essential part of Baptism may be changed^h, viz. the Water, and any other Liquor be used, rather than Baptism should be deferred. Nay, and if *Gerhard* do not misrepresentⁱ him (for I have not *Beza's* Book which he quotes at hand) he scruples not to affirm, 'That he should esteem the Baptism of Satan in the Ministry to be lawful.,' Which are pretty strange Expressions to come from a Man, who thought it a Prophanation of Baptism, and a mere Nullity, to have it administered in the most extreme Necessity by any private Christian. How far the *French Churches* vindicate *Beza* in those two latter Assertions, at present is not very material to enquire: But in the former, that is, in the Doctrine of the Invalidity and Nullity of Lay-Baptism, it is certain they all join with him. At least from the time of the general Synod of *Poitiers* 1560. They were all obliged to defend that Doctrine by Subscription. For in that Synod the Question was put, What was to be done in Case a Child^k had been baptized by a private Person? And the Answer was given, That the Baptism shall be declared Null, and the Child shall be brought publickly into the Church, there to receive true Baptism. This was also inserted into their Book of Discipline, to which they all Swear and Subscribe, *Chap. II. Art. I.* 'That Baptism administered by an Unordained Person is wholly Void and Null.,'

I 3

^h *Beza* Ep. 2. ad *Tillium*.

ⁱ *Gerhard*. Loc. Com. Tom. 4. de Bapt. n. 23. *Beza* Quæst. 144. *Ipsius Satanæ baptismum in ministerio non dubitanter se velle dicere Legitimum asserit.*

^k Vid. *Quick*. Synodicon Gall. Reform. Synod of *Poitiers*. Cap. 6. art. 11.

‘Null.’, The same Resolution was given in many other National Synods, as the 1st and 2nd of *Rochel* 1571, and 1581. the Synod of *Gap* 1603. and the Synod of *Alençon* 1637. Where tho’ the King had sent them a Letter, requiring them to reverse their Decree, and allow of the Baptism of Women and others, according as is done in the *Romish* Church; yet they utterly refused to allow of any such Baptism, as a thing formally contrary to their Belief. This then is indisputably the Practice of the *French* Church. But the Observation a Learned Person makes upon it, is not very Accurate: ‘That we may reasonably suppose, that all the other Reformed Churches, who observe the same Discipline, are of the same Opinion. For this is all Supposition without Proof. For no other Church, that I know of, observes the same Discipline with the *French*, which is peculiar to the *French* Church; and it is Incongruous then to suppose that all the other Reformed Churches observe the same Discipline, when perhaps there is not one that does so. Neither are they all of the same Opinion as to the particular Case before us. For the *Lutherans*, as I have shewed, are all of the opposite side, and manage the contrary part of the Question particularly against the Followers of *Calvin*. *Zuinglius* also agreed with *Luther*, and the *Helvetic* Churches did not very much depart from his Opinions. The *Palatines* also, as I shall presently shew, thought that Baptism administered by Laymen in a grand Dissipation of the Church, was not to be repeated. And I believe neither the *Waldenses*, nor the *Fratres Bohemi* have any different Sentiments from the *Lutherans* upon this Point, tho’ I have not yet had opportunity to make an exact Enquiry into their Opinions. How then can it be supposed that all the Reformed Churches beyond

beyond Seas are of the same Opinion with the *French Church*? I hope my ingenuous Friend, when he sees this, will find it necessary, and becoming his wonted Ingenuity, to retract his unguarded Expression. To say, in a word, all that I know of this Matter, the *Dutch Church* (tho' she does not observe the *French Discipline* any more than any other of the Reformed Churches) joins, I think, with the *French Church* in this Particular, that the Baptism of Laymen is altogether Null and Void, and ought to be repeated. For tho' I have not any of her publick Acts or Declarations to this purpose, yet I find the general Current of her Writers (the *Arminians* excepted) to run this way; and I suppose they speak the Sense of their Church without any Hesitation. So *Rivet*, *Riissenius*, *Ame-sius*, *Vorstius*, and others, with which I think it not necessary, in a plain Case, to trouble the Reader. But then the *Dutch Church* is far from being all the Churches of the Reformation: The *Zuinglians* are a considerable Body; the *Lutherans* are much more so; being spread far and wide thro' many great and populous Nations: And some of them are Episcopal Churches too, which allow this Liberty in Cases extraordinary to Laymen. Whereas by some, the *Dutch* and *French Churches* are reckoned of no Account, but Unchurched, because they want Episcopacy, and consequently true Ordinations and Christian Sacraments in their Opinion: And then what signifies their Testimony in such a Case, if as soon as they have deliver'd their Evidence about Christian Baptism, they shall be cashier'd, and positively declar'd to be no Christians? But I proceed to the remaining Parts of the Reformation.

S. 4.
Of the Palatine
Churches.

The Churches of the *Palatinate* commonly follow the Doctrine of the *Calvinists*, but in one Case some of their Divines make an Exception, as in a time of great Persecution or Dispersion of the Ministry in some grand Dissipation of the Church. Which was a Case that actually happened in the *Palatinate* by the Wars in the last Age, and gave occasion to Dr. *Alting*, Professor of Divinity at *Heidelberg*, to handle this Question among his Problems. The Question he puts in these Terms, Whether that Baptism be lawful, which is administred privately by private Persons, Men or Women? To this he returns Answer in two distinct Propositions: 1. 'That Baptism administred privately by private Persons, Men or Women, ought not to be esteemed lawful Baptism. For which he assigns the common Reasons that are usually alledged in this Case, 1. 'Because it proceeds from a false Opinion of the absolute Necessity of Baptism to Salvation, as if an Infant could not be saved without it. 2. Because Baptism is not to be administred Privately, but Publickly in the sight of the whole Church, as being a part of the Publick Ministry, and to avoid the Magical Ceremonies and Superstitions of the Papists. 3. Because Baptism belongs not to Private Men, but to those who are called to the Ministry of the Word. Which two things are joined together by CHRIST in the Words of Institution, *Matt. xxviii. 19.* 4. Because Women are expressly and by name excluded from all Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, *1 Cor. xiv. 34. 1 Tim. ii. 12.*, But notwithstanding the Illegality of such Baptism, he concludes in a 2^d Proposition against the Repetition of it in Case

Case of a Dissipation of the¹ Church. 'Baptism, says he, administred by Private Men in a grand Dispersion of the Church, is not to be reiterated. We do not say it is Legitimate or Lawful; for we have shewed before, that it is Faulty upon several Accounts: but we say it is not to be repeated with this twofold Condition or Limitation: 1. That it be administred according to CHRIST's Institution, which is, that the Infant be baptized in Water, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 2. That this be done in a Dissipation of the Church, such as we now see every where throughout the *Palatinate*: For in such a state of the Church GOD pardons many things, which in a well-order'd Church it would not be right and proper to admit of. Circumcision, no doubt, was administred with many Faults and Corruptions, whilst Religion itself was so much corrupted among the People of *Israel*; and yet we never read that it was reiterated, when the People were called to the Pure Worship of GOD again. So, in like manner, in the last Age, the Baptism of the Papists was vitiated and defiled with many Superstitions; but

I Alting. Theol. Problem. Par. 2. Quæst. 16. p. 326. Baptismus in Dissipatione Ecclesiæ administratus à Privatis viris non est repetendus. ---- Eum non dicimus Licitum aut Legitimum esse; Est enim trifariam vitiosus, ut ostendimus: Sed non esse iterandum, cum hac duplici Conditione sive Limitatione. 1. Si administratus sit juxta institutionem Christi, Infante aqua asperso in nomine Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti. 2. Si id factum in Dissipatione Ecclesiæ: qualis nunc passim cernitur in *Palatinate*. Siquidem illo Ecclesiæ statu multa Deus condonat, quæ nullo modo admittere fas esset in Ecclesia bene ordinata. ---- Ita superiore sæculo Baptismus Papistarum sædatus & viciatus fuit multis superstitionibus, nec tamen repetitus in Ecclesiis Reformatis, cum secessio fieret à Communione Papatus.

‘ but yet it was never repeated by the Reformed
 ‘ Churches, when they separated themselves from
 ‘ the Communion of the Papacy. „ Thus far we
 have seen the Judgment of the several Churches
 of the Reformation beyond Seas.

§. 5. I come, in the last place, to
The Practice of the consider the Practice of the
Church of England. Church of *England*. Where we
 may observe some difference between the Directi-
 ons given in the Liturgy, as it stood in the Time
 of King *Edward* and Queen *Elizabeth*, and those
 of the Liturgy in the Time of King *James*, which
 receiv’d some Alteration after the Conference at
Hampton-Court. In the old Liturgy, the Rubrick
 of Private Baptism^m run in these words: ‘ First
 ‘ let them that be present call upon GOD for his
 ‘ Grace, and say the Lord’s Prayer, if the time
 ‘ will suffer: And then one of them shall Name
 ‘ the Child, and dip him in the Water, or pour
 ‘ Water upon him, saying these words, *I baptize*
 ‘ *thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and*
 ‘ *of the Holy Ghost.* „ This Rubrick was couched
 in such general Terms, without restraining Pri-
 vate Baptism to a Minister, that hence it is certain
 in Fact, occasion was taken frequently both by
 Laymen and Women to baptize Children Private-
 ly, without a Publick Minister: whence arose
 two Questions among the Learned Men of those
 Days: 1. Whether such Baptisms were legally
 performed, and according to the Intent and Rules
 of the Church? And, 2. if they were Illegal and
 against Rule, whether they were also wholly Null
 and Invalid, and, as such, to be repeated again?
 Upon

^m Hamon l’ Estrange *Alliance of Div. Offices.* c. 8. p. 223.

Upon the first Point Learned Men were a little divided; some were of Opinion, that the words of the Rubrick did no ways authorize Lay-Persons, Men or Women, to baptize in private; but by Private Baptism only meant Baptism administered in a Private House, not publickly in a Church, and this to be given only by the Minister, and not by any Private Person. This was the Sense of Archbishop *Whitgift*, as is evident both from his Answer to the Admonition, and his Defence of it against *Cartwright*. His words are these; ‘The
 ‘Bookⁿ of Common-Prayer doth call it Private
 ‘Baptism, in respect of the Place, which is a private House, and not in respect of the Minister.---
 ‘For even in Necessity the Curate may be sent
 ‘for, or some other Minister that may sooner be
 ‘come by.,, See also the Conference at Hampton-Court. Others think the Church, tho’ she did not approve of this kind of Baptism, yet intended to permit and tolerate it for a time, till Mens Prejudices and wrong Notions, settled in them by long Custom, might gently wear off without any prejudice to the Reformation. So Archbishop *Abbot* gives his Opinion of this Rubrick: ‘As *Moses*, says he, for
 ‘a time^o suffered the *Israelites*, for the hardness
 ‘of their Hearts, to give a Bill of Divorce in
 ‘lesser Causes; so, for the Weakness of Men, and
 ‘Hardness of some, Laymen were suffered to
 ‘baptize. Which I take to have been the true
 ‘Rea-

n *Whitgift Defen. of the Answ. to the Admon. Tract. 9. p. 504.*

o *Abbot. Prælect. 2. de Baptismo p. 97. Præ infirmitate hominum, aut duritia aliquorum, Laicos mysteriis imbuere passi sunt. Quod pro certo existimo in causa fuisse, cur in regno olim nostro, qui abolita superstitione, preces nostras & Liturgiam in certam formam Libramque redegerunt, Privati Baptis-*

Reason, why any mention was made of Private
 Baptism, by those who first abolished Superstiti-
 on, and compiled the Common-Prayer-Book in
 this Kingdom: not that they thought Baptism
 given by Laymen was altogether Legitimate and
 Right; but they were not willing to deter the
 Ignorant and Unlearned People from the true
 Religion at the first dawning of the Reforma-
 tion, by pressing too severely upon them, a
 thing which was so directly contrary to the Opi-
 nion which they had for many Years imbibed.
 But a Toleration and Permission does not con-
 clude that to be Right and Just which is only
 tolerated for a time.' This difference in Mens
 Opinions continued to the time of the *Hampton-
 Court* Conference: for there the several Dispu-
 tants expressed their Minds variously upon it.
 Archbishop *Whitgift* was still of the same Mind,
 That the administration of Baptism by Women
 and Lay-Persons was not allowed in the Pra-
 ctice of the Church, but enquired of by Bishops
 in their Visitations, and censured; neither do
 the words in the Book infer any such meaning.
 But the King excepted to this, and urged the
 words of the Book, that they could not but intend
 a permission and suffering of Women and Private
 Persons to baptize. The Bishop of *Worcester, Ba-
 bington*, said, 'That the words were doubtful, and
 might be pressed to that meaning; but yet it
 seemed

mi mentionem subintulerunt; non quod Baptismus datum per
 Laicos, potissimum autem per Fœminas, Legitimum esse arbi-
 trati fuissent; sed ne primis Evangelii revocandi auspiciis, in-
 doctam & insciam multitudinem à vera Pietate deterrent, il-
 lud ingerendo, quod imbibitæ per multos annos opinioni ex-
 presse adeo adversaretur. ---- Sed Toleratio & Permissio, fas
 & justum esse, quod ad tempus toleratur, non concludit.

p Conferen. at Hampton Court. p. 14.

seemed by the contrary Practice of our Church (censuring Women in this case) that the Compilers of the Book did not so intend them, and yet propounded them ambiguously, because otherwise, perhaps, the Book would not have then passed in Parliament. „ Whereunto *Bancroft*, the Bishop of *London*, replied, ‘ That those Learned and Reverend Men, who framed the Book of Common-Prayer, intended not by ambiguous Terms to deceive any, but did indeed by those words intend a Permission of private Persons to baptize in case of Necessity, whereof their Letters were witnesses; some parts whereof he then read, and withal declar’d, that the same was agreeable to the practice of the Primitive Church.

Bilson, ^q the Bishop of *Winchester*, spake also very learnedly and earnestly in that Point, affirming, ‘ That the denying of private Persons in Cases of Necessity to baptize, were to cross all Antiquity, seeing that it had been the ancient and common Practice of the Church, when Ministers at such times could not be got; and that it was also a Rule agreed upon by Divines, that the Minister is not of the Essence of the Sacrament. To which His Majesty answered, ‘ Though he be not of the Essence of the Sacrament, yet he is of the Essence of the right and lawful Ministry of the Sacrament; taking for his Ground, the Commission of CHRIST to his Disciples, *Matt. xxviii. 20. Go Preach and Baptize.*

Dr. *Willet*, who wrote his Controversies whilst the old Rubrick was in force, was also of Archbishop *Whitgift*’s Opinion, ‘ That neither Laymen
of

‘ of ^r what Calling soever, nor yet Midwives, or
 ‘ any other Women, ought to be suffered in a
 ‘ well-reformed Church to baptize Infants; nei-
 ‘ ther are they authorized so to do amongst us.

This difference there was then in Mens Opini-
 ons concerning the Sense of the Rubrick of our
 Church, as it then stood: But yet they all agreed
 upon the second Point, That whether such Bap-
 tisms were according to Rule or against Rule,
 Permitted or not Permitted, yet they were not
 absolutely Null and Void, or as such to be repeated
 by a lawful Minister in order to obtain Salvation.
 Archbishop *Whitgift* pleads as strongly as any Man
 for the Validity of such Baptisms, tho’ he did not
 believe them to be done according to any Rule,
 or so much as Permission of the Church. In one
 place ^f he argues thus against *Cartwright*, who
 disliked as well Deacons as Womens Baptizing:
 ‘ We read in the Eighth of the *Acts*, that *Philip* a
 ‘ Deacon did Baptize: We read also that *Moses*
 ‘ his Wife did Circumcise. But where doth this
 ‘ Church of *England* allow any Woman to Bap-
 ‘ tize, or Deacon to celebrate the Lord’s Supper?
 ‘ And if it did, the Dignity of the Sacraments do
 ‘ not depend upon the Man, be he Minister or not
 ‘ Minister, be he Good or Evil. Let every one
 ‘ take heed that they do not usurp that Authority
 ‘ whereunto they be not called.’ In another
 place ^t speaking again of *Sephora*’s Circumcision,
 he says, ‘ *Moses* at this time was extremely Sick,
 ‘ and therefore could not execute that Office him-
 ‘ self.’ And in the *Geneva* Bible there is this Note:
 ‘ That it was extraordinary, for *Moses* was sore
 ‘ Sick,

^r Willet Synopsis Papismi. p. 490.

^f Whitgift Defen. of the Answer to the Admonit. Tract. 9. p. 515.

^t Ibid. p. 517.

‘ Sick, and GOD even then required it. *Sephora*
‘ therefore did Circumcise in a point of Extremi-
‘ ty, and not willfully or of purpose: And that
‘ Circumcision was a true Circumcision, tho’ it
‘ were not done ordinarily: Even so Baptism is
‘ true Baptism, tho’ it be sometimes ministred by
‘ such as are not ordinary Ministers. ,, A little
after ^u he pleads the universal Practice of all
Churches, Ancient and Modern: ‘ Altho’, says he,
‘ divers, both old and new, do not allow that Lay-
‘ men should be suffered to baptize; yet there is
‘ none of them (such only excepted as err in Re-
‘ baptismation) that think the Being of the Sacra-
‘ ment so to depend upon the Minister, that it is
‘ no Sacrament if it be not celebrated by a Mini-
‘ ster. ,, Here he alledges *Tertullian*, *Ambrose*, *Fe-
rom*, *Austin*, *Zuinglius*. and *Calvin* himself. And
then concludes, that if his Adversaries Doctrine
were true, there had need be some general Rebap-
tization throughout all *Christendom*, as well of
Men as of Children, for certain it is, that that
Sacrament hath been ministred to many, by such
as be in no Degree of the Ministry. He urges
farther ^w the famous Example of *Athanasius*, and
the *Jew* that was baptized in Sand instead of Wa-
ter, by a Layman. This latter was Rebaptized,
but not the former. ‘ This argueth, says he, that
‘ the Church then made no doubt in respect of the
‘ Persons that ministred this Baptism, but only be-
‘ cause there lacked Water. ---- And certainly if
‘ the Being of the Sacrament depended upon
‘ Man in any respect, we were but in a miserable
‘ Case: For we should be always in doubt, whe-
‘ ther

^u Ibid. p. 518.

^w Ibid. p. 519.

'ther we were rightly baptized or no. But it is
 'most true, that the Force and Strength of the
 'Sacrament is not in the Man, be he Minister or
 'not Minister, be he Good or Evil, but in God him-
 'self, in his Spirit, in his free and effectual Ope-
 'ration. This I speak not to bring Confusion in-
 'to the Church: (For, as I said before, let Men
 'take heed that they usurp not an Office, where-
 'unto they be not called, for God will call them
 'to an Account for so doing) but to teach a truth,
 'to take a Yoke of Doubtfulness from Mens Con-
 'sciences, and to resist an Error not much differ-
 'ing from Donatism and Anabaptism.' He final-
 ly illustrates this Matter ^x from the Example of
 Preaching: 'He that speaketh the Words of Scrip-
 'ture, and doth interpret them, Preacheth, tho'
 'he be not thereunto called: And it is the true
 'Word of God he Preacheth, if he truly inter-
 'pret; but he intrudeth himself into a Vocation
 'whereunto he is not called, and therefore offen-
 'deth God: But that doth derogate nothing
 'from the Word Preached. The same Reason is
 'of the Administration of the Sacraments: For,
 'as the Word of God is the Word of God, by
 'whomsoever it be Preached, Minister or other,
 'so is the Sacrament of Baptism true Baptism by
 'whomsoever it be celebrated: The Usurper of
 'the Office hath to answer for his Intrusion, but
 'the Sacrament is not thereby defiled.' And a little
 after ^y, 'I go not about to prove that Women may
 'Baptize, only I withstand this Error, That the
 'Substance and Being of the Sacraments depend-
 'eth upon the Man in any respect. I say, that
 'Baptism

^x *Whitgift* *ibid.* p. 520.

^y *ibid.* p. 521.

‘Baptism ministred by Women is true Baptism,
‘tho’ it be not lawful for Women to baptize; as
‘the Baptism also ministred by Hereticks is true
‘Baptism, tho’ they be Usurpers of the Office.
‘And I further say, that if the Baptism admini-
‘stred by Heretical Ministers, which be no Mem-
‘bers of the Church, be notwithstanding good
‘and effectual, I see no Cause why it should not
‘be so rather, if it be ministred by Laymen which
‘are Members and Parts of the Church.’ Mr.
Hooker had occasion to answer *Cartwright* upon the
same subject, and he does it almost as copiously as
the Archbishop, but I shall only transcribe one
Passage, wherewith he concludes his Discourse
upon it. ‘Last of all, says he, whereas ^z general
‘and full Consent of the Godly-learned in all
‘Ages doth make for Validity of Baptism, yea, al-
‘beit administred in private, and even by Wo-
‘men; which kind of Baptism, in Case of Necessi-
‘ty, divers Reformed Churches do both allow and
‘defend; some others, which do not defend, to-
‘lerate; few, in comparison, and they without
‘any just Cause, do utterly disannul and annihilate:
‘Surely, howsoever through Defect on either side,
‘the Sacrament may be without Fruit, as well in
‘some Cases to him that receiveth, as to him
‘which giveth it, yet no Disability of either part
‘can so far make it frustrate and without Effect,
‘as to deprive it of the very nature of true Bap-
‘tism, having all things else which the Ordinance
‘of CHRIST requireth.’ Whereupon we may
consequently infer, that the Administration of
this Sacrament by Private Persons, be it lawful
or unlawful, appeareth not as yet to be meerly
K Void.

Void. Archbishop *Abbot*, in his Theological Lecture fore the University of *Oxford*, largely maintains the same Opinion, that such Baptisms ^a tho' irregularly given, are not to be repeated. His Reasons are, 1. Because the Person of the Minister is not of the Essence or Being of the Sacrament, but only of the Well-being. The Form of the Sacrament is Baptizing in Water in the Name of the Trinity. Therefore it is most agreeable to the Rules of Piety, to have it done only by a Minister; but yet it is done, tho' it be done by another. 2. He argues from the Axiom of the Law, which is, *Multa fieri non debent, quæ tamen facta valent*; Many things ought not to be done, which yet are Valid when they are done: As the Marriage of Children against the Consent of their Parents, which is a thing that ought not to be done, but yet it is Valid when it is done. 3. He argues from the general and perpetual Consent and Practice of the Church. 4. From the Sense and Practice of the Church of *England*, which, for a time, tolerated such Baptisms, and left this Direction in the old Rubrick of Private Baptism, 'Let them not doubt that the Child so baptized, is lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again.' 5. Lastly, from the Inconveniencies that would attend the contrary Practice among the whole Congregation of Christians. For if none but a Priest every way qualified without Exception, might in any case baptize, how great a part of Faithful and Pious Christians would want the Seal of their Christianity? Or who could be certain, that he him-

^a Abbot. Prælect. 2. de Bapt. p. 99. Ministrantis Personam non de esse Sacramenti, sed de bene esse judicarunt. --- Pie igitur fit, si Minister tangat solus; at fit etiam si tangat alius.

himself was baptized in every respect as he ought to be? For one that was never Ordained may take upon him the Person of a Priest. Or perhaps one may take Holy Orders, who never was baptized. Or if he was Baptized and Ordained, he may be Consecrated by a Bishop who was no lawful Bishop, nor had any Power to give Imposition of Hands to others. These and such like Doubts both may and often do happen, as Reason and Experience testify. Whence he concludes, upon the whole Matter, 'That Baptism is Valid, tho' given by a Layman or Woman, having the perpetual Consent of the Church, and not being repugnant to the Truth of the Divine Oracles.' This Writer read his Lectures in *Oxford* in the Year 1597. And about 5 or 6 Years after there was a Treatise published in the Name of the whole University of *Oxford*, wherein the same Doctrine is defended. This was the Answer to the *Millenary Petition*. The Title is, *The Answer of the University of Oxford to a Petition of some Ministers of the Church of England, desiring Reformation of certain Ceremonies.* Oxon. 1603. 4°. At *Cambridge* the same Assertion was maintained by *Whitaker*^b, as *Dr. Forbes*^c alleges him, who dislikes his Opinion. And if Archbishop *Abbot* was a competent Judge of the Books then written, there were few or none of the Church of *England* in those days that determined otherwise. Many were inclined to censure Lay-Baptism as Irregular and Unlawful, but they all agreed in this, That it was Valid, and not to be repeated as a meer Nullity, when once it was done. 'The present Times, says he, as far as I can judge, have

K 2

^b Whitaker. de Baptismo. Q. 3. c. 1.

^c Forbes. Instruct. Histor. Theol. Lib. 10. c. 14.

‘ have not departed ^d from the Determination of
 ‘ their Fore-Fathers, but keep it as a Depositum
 ‘ handed down from them.’ *Cartwright* indeed,
 and his Followers, who affected the *French* Disci-
 pline more than they did the *English*, went gene-
 rally the other way, and declared openly not only
 against the Lawfulness, but the Validity of Lay-
 Baptisms in any Case whatsoever. And therefore
 they continually declaimed against the Old Ru-
 brick of Private Baptism, and importunately cal-
 led for an Alteration. This, among other things,
 brought on the Conference at *Hampton-Court*, the
 Result of which was, that the Rubrick should be
 made a little more plain, by inserting the Word
Lawful Minister, instead of the general Term,
One of them that be present, as it was ambiguously
 worded before. This determined the Question a-
 bout the lawfulness of Lay-Baptism so far, as
 that now it could not well be thought to be per-
 mitted or enjoined by the Church. But as to the
 other Question, about the Validity of Lay-Bap-
 tisms when done, the Divines of the Church deter-
 mined still the same way that they had done before.
 For tho’ some alteration was made in the Rubrick,
 and the Word *Lawful Minister* inserted: Yet they
 thought still no intimation was given, that Private
 Baptisms by any other beside a Lawful Minister
 should be esteemed absolutely Null and Invalid;
 nor any Provision made in that Case that they
 should be repeated. *Isaac Casaubon*, who wrote by
 the order of King *James*, and in defence of him
 against Cardinal *Perron*, some Years after the Con-
 ference at *Hampton-Court*, speaks thus in the Name
 of

^d Abbot. *Prælect. de Bapt.* 2. p. 104. *Nostra etiam tempora,*
quantum ego novi, ab eorum Determinatione non discesserunt,
sed tanquam Depositum apud nos, & traditum custodiunt.

of the Church of *England*: 'What^e was heretofore
 'said by *Tertullian* concerning the Primitive
 'Church, that Baptism was administred by Bi-
 'shops, Priests and Deacons: and that Laymen
 'also, in Cases of extreme Necessity, might do it;
 'the very same is now observed in the Church of
 '*England*, so far as concerns Bishops, Presbyters,
 'and Deacons, without tying them strictly to any
 'rigid Observation of Time or Place: And for
 'the Baptism of Lay Persons, Men or Women,
 'tho' she forbid it to be done by her Laws; yet
 'when it is done in due Form, she does not alto-
 'gether disallow or reject it, pronouncing it to
 'be Baptism, tho' not lawfully administred.

King *James* asserted the same in the *Hampton-
 Court* Conference: For tho' he so expounded the
 Necessity of Baptism, as that it was only necessary
 to be had, where it might be lawfully had, that
 is, ministred by Lawful Ministers, by whom alone,
 and by no Private Person, he thought, it might
 in any Case be administred; yet he said, he
 utterly disliked^f all Rebaptization, although either
 Women or Laicks had baptized.

And indeed he shewed his dislike upon some
 particular Occasions: For when one Mr. *Crompton*
 had written a Book called, *St. Austin's Religion*,
 K 3 'where-

^e Casaubon. Respon. ad Epist. Perron. p. 33. Lond. 1612:
 Quod igitur de nascente olim Ecclesia dixit Tertullianus, bap-
 tizare Episcopum, Presbyterum, Diaconum: Postremo etiam
 Laicis jus esse, in extrema videlicet necessitatis casu; hoc ip-
 sum in Ecclesia Anglicana, quod ad Episcopos, Presbyteros &
 Diaconos hodieque servatur, sine ulla vel loci vel temporis rigi-
 da & penitus inviolabili observatione: Laicorum vero baptis-
 mum, aut sœminarum, ut fieri Legibus suis vetat; sic factum ex
 legitima Formula quodammodo non improbat, baptismum esse
 pronuncians, etsi non legitime administratum.

^f Conference at Hampton-Court, p. 18.

wherein he had asserted, 'That ^g for a Layman, 'and much more for a Woman, to baptize, in 'Case of Necessity, was, in St. *Austin's* Opinion, 'a pardonable Sin; tho' pardonable, yet a Sin, 'and the usurping of another's Office: Dr. *Featly* tells us, ^h King *James*, in part, disliked that which Mr. *Crompton* had delivered. And when he defended himself, by saying, 'That in the Conference at *Hampton-Court*, Womens Baptizing was 'utterly condemned; and whereas before, Women were allowed to baptize in Case of Necessity, the new Rubrick restrained Baptism to the 'Lawful Minister: The King excepted to this Answer, and told him, 'That in all the several 'Impressions of the Book of Common-Prayer, 'there was nothing said of a Woman's baptizing, 'neither to warrant it to be done, nor to condemn it when it was done. Neither doth St. *Austin* simply condemn a Layman or Woman baptizing in Case of Necessity, as a Sin, but saith, 'either it is no Fault, or a pardonable one.' And this, he said, was the sum of the Resolution at *Hampton-Court* in this Point, howsoever some had mistaken it. By which it plainly appears, what was the Judgment of King *James* concerning the Sense and Practice of the *English* Church, that tho' she had given no Authority to Lay-Persons to baptize, yet neither did she absolutely condemn it when it was done, or by any publick Act order it to be repeated. This was the King's Judgment, delivered upon this Occasion a few Weeks before his Death.

In the Reign of King *Charles* the First, one *Ambrose Fisher* wrote a Defence of the Liturgy of the

^g *Crompton's Relig. of St. Austin.* p. 95.

^h *Featley's Cygnea Cantio.* p. 21.

the Church of *England*, *Lond.* 1630. wherein he maintains the same Assertion, 'That tho' Laymen
'were prohibited to baptize; yet when it was
'done, their Baptism was valid and not to be re-
'peated.

Dr. *Forbes* indeed, the Learned *Scotch* Professor, set himself to oppose this in a particular Dissertation among his *Historical Theological Instructions*ⁱ, where the Reader may find the whole strength of the contrary Side. But he goes upon such Principles as cannot possibly be maintain'd by any *English* Divine, nor were ever maintain'd by any ancient Writer; for he argues as much against the Lawfulness and Validity of Baptism administred by Deacons, as by Laymen; when yet nothing can be plainer than the Power and Authority which the Church gives them in the Office and Form of their Ordination; for there they are told, 'That it appertaineth to the Office of a Deacon
'in the Church, in the absence of the Priest, to
'baptize Infants: and accordingly, when the Bishop says, *Take thou Authority to execute the Office of a Deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee*, it must be understood, that, among other things, the Power and Authority of Baptizing is conferred upon them. But now, if the Baptism of Deacons be invalid, as Dr. *Forbes* asserts, if none but a Priest can administer it, nor grant Absolution and Pardon of Sins, that belongs to that Sacrament; then the Church of *England* has been hitherto mistaken in conferring Orders upon Deacons, and investing them with Authority to baptize. But if the Church has Power to authorize Deacons to baptize, then their Baptism is not

K 4

only

ⁱ *Forbes. Instruct. Hist. Lib. 10. cap. 14.*

only valid, but authorized and authentick too. And that Learned Person, and all others who invalidate the Baptism of Deacons, upon this Principle, That they want Sacerdotal Powers, are under a great Mistake, to oppose a Practice so firmly established in the Constitution of the Church of *England*. However it be, it is certain, there is a manifest Opposition betwixt him and the Church upon this Head; and therefore he cannot be supposed to speak the Sense of our Church, when he invalidates the Baptism of Deacons. Nor does he produce any Rule of the Church to invalidate the Baptism of Laymen, but proceeds upon other Grounds, which have been considered in the foregoing Parts of this Discourse.

Bishop *Taylor* also argues for the Invalidity of Laymens Baptism^k in any Case whatsoever: but he does not pretend the Church has given any Order to rebaptize such as are unlawfully baptized by Laymen. Nor do I know any Author, till of late, that has pleaded the Authority of the Church for Rebaptization in such Cases; but the sense which was given by *Casaubon* and King *James* has generally passed for the sense of the Church of *England*. And indeed if the Church had intended more, it had been easy when she alter'd her Rubrick, forbidding any but a Lawful Minister to baptize, to have inserted a farther Order and Decree, to rebaptize all such as were otherwise baptized; as the *French* Church did, both in her Canons and Book of Discipline, because she thought all Baptisms that were not given by a Lawful Minister to be absolutely Null and Void. Which

^k Taylor Ductor Dubitant. Lib. 3. c. 4. Rule 15. p. 638.

Which the Church of *England* having never yet done, it may be presumed it was not her sense to make her Discipline so Rigorous as that of the *French Church*, in requiring Rebaptization. At least *Casaubon* and King *James*, who were very capable of knowing her sense, so understood it, and we do not find many that have been inclin'd to contradict them. So that, upon the whole, it must be concluded, for any thing that yet appears to the contrary, that what *Casaubon* said in the Name of King *James*, is the present sense of the Church of *England*: She forbids Lay-Men or Women, by her Laws, to baptize; but if it be done in due Form, tho' she does not approve of it, yet she does not wholly disannul it, or order it to be repeated, as absolutely Null and Void. And whether any Alteration is proper to be made in this Affair, is none of my Province to determine: I have performed, as far as I could, the Part of a faithful Historian, to correct the Errors of some, and inform the Judgment of others, and leave the rest to be determined in a Lawful Assembly.

A N APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

Some Remarks on the Historical Part of Mr. Lawrence's Writings, touching the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, his Preliminary Discourse of the various Opinions of the Fathers concerning Re-baptization and Invalid Baptisms, and his Discourse of Sacerdotal Powers.

WHEN I had almost finish'd the foregoing Discourse, I had occasion to look into these Writings, as containing some Historical Matters relating to the present Subject. I was the more tempted to inspect them, because the Author pretends to write with great Accuracy, even to a Mathematical Exactness. I will not concern myself, at present, with his Reasonings, but only his History, in which he will pardon me if I friendly shew him and the World some few of his Mistakes, which are neither according to the Rules of History, nor the Exactness of a Mathematical Method and Way of Writing. In his Discourse of *Sacerdotal Powers*, Chap. 5. p. 120. he has these words: 'After the Council of Nice, the Major Proposition, That those whom a Laick baptizeth,

baptizeth, are to be rebaptized, was look'd up-
 on to be so true, that it was the undoubted
 Principle whereby the Orthodox confuted the
Luciferians; for thus they argued: Those whom
 a Laick baptizeth, are to be rebaptized; but
 those whom an *Arian* Priest baptizeth, are not
 to be rebaptized: Therefore an *Arian* Priest is
 not a Laick. This Argument so confounded
Hilary the Deacon, that he was forced to deny
 the Major, which his Master *Lucifer* had granted
 before, viz. That those whom a Laick baptizeth,
 are to be rebaptized; and which *St. Jerom* af-
 firms by the Authority of the *Nicene Council*.
Hieron. Dial. adver. Lucif. *St. Chrysostom*, Archbi-
 shop of *Constantinople*, *An. 398.* is exprefs for the
 Invalidity of Lay-Baptism; and that in Cases of
 Necessity it can be no more administred by a
 Laick, than the Eucharist. *Chrys. Lib. 3. de Sacerd. c. 5.*
 But all these are things, says he, which can be
 administred by no other Man living, but by
 those Sacred Hands alone, the Hands, I say, of
 the Priest. These are Instances for which I am
 beholden to the Learned and Reverend *Mr. Wil-*
liam Reeves's Notes on the 2^d Vol. of the *Apol.*
 of *Justin Martyr*, p. 263, 264. Thus far our
 Author.

In which Paragraph there are abundance of
 Mistakes, of several kinds. The first and least is
 his misquoting *Mr. Reeves* his Notes on *Justin*
Martyr, instead of *Vincentius Lirinensis*. 2. He
 makes *Mr. Reeves* say, what he really does not,
 That *Hilary* the Deacon was forced to deny the
 Major (Proposition in the Argument) which his
 Master *Lucifer* had granted before, viz. That those
 whom a Laick baptizeth, are to be rebaptized;
 and that *St. Jerom* affirms this by the Authority
 of the *Nicene Council*: Whereas *Mr. Reeves* says
 expressly,

expresly, That *Hilary* the Deacon did not deny the Major Proposition, but the Assumption, which his Master *Lucifer* had granted ; which was, That those whom an *Arian* Priest baptizeth, are not to be rebaptized ; and that it was this Assumption which *St. Jerom* confirmed by the Authority of the *Nicene* Council. *Mr. Lawrence* did not here distinguish between a Major and a Minor Proposition, but unluckily changes *Mr. Reeves's* Terms, and puts Major instead of Assumption, which stands for a Minor Proposition only in all Logicks whatsoever. We are not like to find, I am afraid, great Exactness in History, when it is to be fetch'd from ancient *Greek* and *Latin* Authors, by a Person who could make so unhappy a Mistake only in transcribing an *English* Author. Let us next examine, 3^{dly}, what Errors he commits in point of ancient History, by virtue of this Mistake : He makes *Lucifer* hereby a Witness for the Invalidity of Laymens Baptism, by making him say, That those whom a Laick baptizeth, are to be rebaptized : Which Proposition, when he produces *Lucifer's* plain Testimony for it, shall have my assent, and not before. 4. He makes *St. Jerom* affirm universally the same thing : and yet it is as plain as words can make it, that *St. Jerom* allowed Laymen to give Baptism in Cases of Necessity, as I have proved before from that very Dialogue against the *Luciferians*, upon which he grounds the contrary Assertion. 5. He makes *St. Jerom* assert that pretended Proposition upon the Authority of the *Nicene* Council : And yet neither is there any such Canon in the *Nicene* Council, nor did ever *St. Jerom* assert there was, but only a Canon about allowing some Heretical Bishops and Priests to enjoy the Honour of their Places, and not be degraded to Laymen, upon their Return
to

to the Unity of the Catholick Church. 6. He says, *St. Chrysostom* is exprefs for the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism; and that in Cafes of Neceffity it can be no more adminiftred by a Laick, than the Eucharift: But *St. Chrysostom* neither exprefly mentions the Cafe of Neceffity, nor Lay-Baptism, nor the Invalidity of it; but only fays, Baptism is not adminiftred by any but the Hands of a Priest: Which, if it were to be taken in the ftrictest fense, to exclude all others besides Priests; in Cafes of extreme Neceffity, it would exclude Deacons as well as Laymen; unlefs this Author will fay, that Deacons are Priests, or fhew that *St. Chrysostom* thought them to be fo, which I am fure he did not, and yet he allowed them to baptize in Cafes of Neceffity, when a Priest could not be had, as I have fully proved before, againft *Dr. Forbes*, in answer to this very Objection. But if fuch Men as *Dr. Forbes*, and *Mr. Reeves*, who was this Author's Guide, were under fome Miftake in this Matter, I do not wonder a lefs skilful Writer fhould readily follow them: But for his other Miftakes, they are fo grofs and palpable, that I think he is bound in Juftice, both to *Mr. Reeves* and the World, ingenuoufly to acknowledge his Mifrepresentation, and correct his Errors, as he has modestly promifed to do, when any one modestly better informs him.

The next thing I fhall take notice of is, his Treatment of *St. Basil*, in whose Mouth he puts an Argument, and makes him contradict himself upon it. He fays, p. 119. *St. Basil* thus argues: 'Those
' whom a Laick baptizeth, are to be rebaptized:
' But those whom an Heretick or Schismatick baptizeth, a Laick baptizeth: Therefore fuch are
' to

to be rebaptized. This Argument he made use of to prove, that Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were Null and Void; and he reckon'd them so, because he thought them of the same nature as Lay-Baptisms in those Days. His Major Proposition, That those whom a Laick baptizeth are to be rebaptized, was not deny'd; he had no Opposers to defend such Baptisms. All the Opposition he met with, was, that they deny'd his Minor, That those whom an Heretick or Schismatick baptizeth, a Laick baptizeth. --- And therefore tho' they did not deny but Lay-Baptism was Null and Void; yet they affirmed Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms to be Good, because they were not Lay-Baptisms; and to this *St. Basil* consented. *Basil. Canon. Ep. ad Amphilocho. can. I.*

But did *St. Basil* consent, that Hereticks and Schismaticks were Laymen and not Laymen at the same time? Did he consent that their Baptism was Null and Void, and yet Good too notwithstanding? Either *St. Basil* was very weak so to contradict himself, or else our Author was very weak to father such a Contradiction upon him. But perhaps he had it from *Mr. Reeves*, to whom he professes himself beholden for all these Instances. No indeed, it is an Improvement upon *Mr. Reeves*, I think; but, if otherwise, *Mr. Reeves* must answer for himself. In the mean time I will answer our Author. *St. Basil* does not bring that as his own Argument, but only relates it as the Argument of *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian*: But our Author does not distinguish between a Man's acting the part of an Historian, and that of a Logician: He might as well say, all the Arguments I have related in this Book are my own, because I have related so many Mens Arguments and Opinions upon the present Subject.

Subject. If he had looked into St. *Basil* himself, he might have seen this. But was not St. *Basil* of Opinion, that Lay-Baptisms and Heretical Baptisms were Null and Void? Yes. But he did not then say, they were Good and Valid too: But only he was so modest, as not to condemn or break Communion with those Churches, who differed both in Opinion and Practice from him. And therefore, because there were other Churches in *Asia*, who allowed of the Baptism of Schismatics as Valid, he advises those who were Members of those Churches, to comply with the Custom and Practice of their respective Churches. *ἔστω δεκτόν.* Let it be received. But he does not say the same of Hereticks, but thinks every Church ought to repeat their Baptism. For he makes a great Distinction between the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics; and so our Author should have distinguished, if he would rightly have represented St. *Basil's* Opinion. For tho', in his own private Judgment, he was for Rebaptizing both of them, yet he makes some Allowance for Schismatics, who kept the Faith, which he does not for Hereticks who destroyed it. And therefore admits of a Compliance in other Churches, in the one Case, which he does by no means allow in the other. I have produced the Passage at large in the first *Chapter*, *Seet.* 20. To which the Reader may have Recourse.

I come next to his Preliminary Discourse of the various Opinions of the Fathers concerning Rebaptization and Invalid Baptisms. Here I observe in general, that he delivers ancient History often very Magisterially, without referring his Reader to any particular Places in his Authors, whereby to judge of the Truth of his Assertions. Thus he says, *p.* 2. that the *Stephanians*, among other Arguments

ments which they mustered up for the Validity of Heretical Baptisms, used this for one: 'That all Catechumens, who died Unbaptized, were not therefore Damned; much less those who had received Baptism, though from Hereticks or Schismatics.' I do not Dispute his Assertion about the Catechumens, but desire him only to inform the World, in what Writing of the *Stephanians*, as he calls them, he finds this maintained, That they who had received Baptism from Hereticks or Schismatics were in a State of Salvation. And when he alledges his Author, we shall be better able to judge of the Truth of the Assertion.

Pag. 10. He tells us, *Athanasius*, in the Fourth Century, rejected the Baptism of Hereticks. By which he would insinuate, that *Athanasius* was of *Cyprian's* Opinion, and rejected the Baptism of all Hereticks in general. But he refers his Reader to no place, and he is left to look it in two or three large Volumes of *Athanasius's* Works: Yet I suppose he means his third Oration against the *Arians*, Tom. I. p. 413. where he disputes against the *Arians* Baptism, and rejects it as invalid, because they rejected the Fundamental Doctrine of the Trinity, tho' they kept to the Form of Baptizing used in the Church. But this is not simply to reject the Baptism of Hereticks; for he allowed the Baptism of all others, as I have shewed in the foregoing Discourse. Chap. I. Sect. 20.

In the same Page he brings the Testimony of *Pacianus*, without referring the Reader to any place where to find it, and it is scarce worth his while to enquire after it: for it is alledg'd to no manner of purpose: For what if *Pacianus* says, 'That Baptism purifies from Sins, and Unction brings down the Holy Spirit; and both the one and the other are applied by the Hand and the

L

Mouth

‘Mouth of the Bishop?’ What does this Testimony testify concerning Rebaptization or Invalid Baptism? Either it signifies nothing at all, or else it signifies more than our Author would have it signify, that no Baptism is Valid, no more than Confirmation, that is not applied by the Hand and Mouth of a Bishop: For this would destroy all Sacerdotal Powers, and make the Baptism of Priests Invalid, as well as that of Deacons and Laymen.

Pag. 11. In the next place he produces *Optatus*, but still keeps his Reader in the dark, and leaves him to read over seven Books against *Parmenian*, to find a single Passage in that Author, who seems to think, he says, ‘That we ought to rebaptize those who were baptized by Hereticks; but does not make the same Determination concerning those who were baptized by Schismaticks.’ But if our Author had dealt kindly by his Reader, he should have referr’d him to the fifth Book of *Optatus*, p. 85. where he might have found, without any trouble, that it was not the Baptism of all Hereticks that he rejected, but only such as did not baptize into the Faith of the Holy Trinity: For *Optatus* was of the same Opinion with *Athanasius*, and says, If Men were baptized in the Faith of the Trinity, their Baptism was not repeated when they came over to the Catholick Church. I have produced the Passage at large above, and need not here repeat it.

His Reflections on the Council of *Eliberis*, which follow immediately after, are just enough: That it was but a particular Council; and that it authorized only some Laymen to Baptize, but not all; and those not Anti-Episcopal, but in Subjection to their Bishops.

But

But his next Reflections on the first Council of *Arles*, p. 12. are not so Just and Accurate. For he diminishes the Authority of this Council, by following the faulty Subscriptions, which make but Thirty-three Bishops to have been present at it. Whereas it was a Plenary Council of the whole *Western Church*, as *St. Austin* calls it, consisting of Two-hundred Bishops, as *Baronius*, *Schelstrate*, *Pagi*, and most other Learned Criticks, except *Valesius*, readily allow. He says farther, p. 13. 'That the
'ancient Hereticks and Schismatics, whose Bap-
'tisms that Council allowed, had commonly re-
'ceived Ordination from the Hands of some Ca-
'tholick Bishop or other; whence he concludes,
'that those Baptisms were not Anti-Episcopal:'
Which are both mistaken Assertions. For many of the Heresies and Schisms of those Times had a long Succession of false Bishops of their own, who were not ordained by Catholick Bishops, as the *Novatians*, *Quartadecimans*, and several others, who certainly did not act by any Authority of the Catholick Church, whilst they were out of the Holy Catholick Church, and in manifest Opposition to it. And tho' they had all been ordained by Catholick Bishops, yet they were no longer Authorized to minister by the Catholick Church, than they continued in the Church: But as soon as they fell into Heresies and Schisms, they were Anti-Episcopal, properly speaking, till they returned to the Center of Unity in the Church again. If this Author thinks otherwise, let him speak his Mind plainly and roundly upon it. In the mean time I will venture to assert, that Anti-Episcopal Baptisms were, in some sense, the subject of that Council, forasmuch as Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were the subject of it.

Pag. 13. He says, ' After the Council of *Nice*,
' It was a prevailing Principle, that those whom
' a Laick Baptized were to be Rebaptized; and
' that even *Lucifer* himself granted this Proposition
' to be true.' But I have already accounted with
this Author for his many and great Mistakes about
this Matter, and therefore shall not here repeat
them.

Pag. 16. He alledges the Eighth Canon of the
Second Council of *Carthage*, in these words: ' If a
' Priest Excommunicated by his own Bishop, un-
' dertake to offer up the Sacrifices in private, and
' to set up Altar against Altar, thereby making a
' Schism, he ought to be Anathematiz'd; because
' there is but one Church, one Faith, and one
' Baptism. His Remark upon this Canon is, that
' this one Baptism cannot be supposed to be out of
' this one Church, and therefore is only in it.'
But this Remark is made with great Faintness and
Ambiguity. Why did he not speak plainly, and
say, All such Baptisms are utterly Void, Null, and
Invalid, and as such to be repeated again? But
perhaps he was sensible, this was too plain against
the mind of the Council, which did not intend to
declare such Baptisms absolutely Invalid and Void;
but only Unlawfully given by Persons who had
no Authority to give them in such a Capacity,
whilst they continued in such a Schismatical Op-
position to their Bishop, tho' they had otherwise
received a lawful Ordination from him. Which
may convince our Author, if he will be convinced,
that all Unauthorized and Unlawful Baptisms are
not presently Invalid: For a Priests Baptism, if it
be given in such Circumstances as the Council
supposes, is Unauthorized and Unlawful, as well
as that of a Layman, and yet not to be repeated,
when

when the Party so Baptized returns to the Church again. And it may convince him farther, that these Terms, Unauthorized-Baptism, Invalid-Baptism, and Lay-Baptism, are Terms of different Import, tho' they are usually confounded together and made Equivalent by our Author, which is the *πρώτον ψεύδος*, or the reigning Error that runs thro' his whole Book. For,

Pag. 24. He repeats this again, 'That the Church has not in any general Council made any Determination about Unauthorized and Anti-Episcopal Baptisms:' As if either the Baptisms of Hereticks, or Schismatics, or Excommunicated Priests were not Unauthorized, or the Councils of *Nice*, or *Arles*, or *Carthage* last mentioned had made no Decree about them.

Pag. 26. 'He says, his Province is only confined to Lay, i. e. Unauthorized-Baptism, such as is performed by Persons who never were Authorized for that purpose. ---- And the Adversary can bring forth, in their behalf, not one Council, either General or Provincial, till the corrupt ones of the Church of *Rome*.' Here he again confounds Lay-Baptisms and Unauthorized-Baptisms together. As if all Lay-Baptisms were simply Unauthorized, when they sometimes had the Authority of Bishops and Canons to Authorize them in certain Cases. Or as if there could be no Unauthorized-Baptisms but meer Lay-Baptisms; when yet it is so plain, that the Baptism of Excommunicated Priests are Unauthorized, as well as those of meer Laymen. And how can it be said, with truth, that no Council can be produced for the Validity of Lay-Baptism, or Unauthorized-Baptism, when he himself owns, that the

the Council of *Eliberis* Authorized the one, and so many Councils confirmed the Validity of the other.

Pag. 28. He alledges *Tertullian* in these Words :
‘ Baptism is reserved to the Bishop : Hereticks are
‘ not able to give it, because they have it not ;
‘ and therefore it is that we have a Rule to Re-
‘ baptize them. ’ These few words are tacked together from two or three different places of *Tertullian*, and therefore he would have done well to have pointed out the distinct Books and Chapters to his Readers : Which I have done to his hand in the foregoing Discourse : The Places are, *Tertul. de Bapt. c. 15. and 17. and de Pudicitia. c. 19.* Where he talks of a Rule indeed to baptize Hereticks again ; but that Rule was not what our Author says it was, the Law and Practice of the Church, but the *Præceptum Domini in Evangelio*, the Law of CHRIST and the Apostles, as *Tertullian* himself words it, which is the Rule upon which he founded Rebaptization of Hereticks, however our Author came to mistake it. In the Book *de Pudicitia*, I own he speaks of the Practice of Rebaptizing Hereticks as Heathens ; but the Rule by which he justifies this Practice, is not the Rule of the Church, but the Rule of CHRIST. Yet our Author here could easily discern, when it was for his Turn, that *Tertullian* talked of a Rule, and that that Rule must needs be the Law and Rule of the Church distinct from the Law of CHRIST. But when *Tertullian* speaks of Laymens having a Licence to Baptize in Cases of Necessity, then, in our Author’s Opinion, he vents strange odd Notions, his own private Opinions, and not the Churches Custom and Allowance : tho’ any Unprejudiced Person, that will compare the Places together

together, will find, that he makes the one the Practice of the Church as well as the other, and founds them both equally upon the Law of CHRIST, or the Rule of the Gospel, which our Author mistook for a Canon of the Church.

Pag. 29. He says, the Council of *Eliberis*, in the Fourth Century, made a Rule for the Allowance of Lay-Baptism: And yet a little before we heard him say, pag. 26. That Lay-Baptism was the same as Unauthorized-Baptism, and that there was not so much as a Provincial Council to be produced in its behalf, till the corrupt ones of *Rome*.

In the same Page he insists again upon the Testimonies of St. *Basil*, St. *Chrysostom*, and the Catholics disputing with the *Luciferians* in the same Century, as more than a Ballance against *Tertullian's* private Opinion. But why did he not think the Council of *Eliberis* more than a Ballance against them? who if they were indeed against the Opinion of *Tertullian*, a Private Person, they were also as much against the Publick Opinion of the Council of *Eliberis*. But, in truth, the greater part of these pretended Testimonies are neither against *Tertullian*, nor the Council of *Eliberis*; as I have particularly noted of St. *Chrysostom* and St. *Jerom*, more than once in the foregoing Dissertation. But because our Author talks so frequently and so much of the Catholics (in the Plural) disputing with the *Luciferians* in the Fourth Century, I desire him to acquaint us, what Authors he has read against the *Luciferians*, besides St. *Jerom*, and I will be one of those that will give him my Thanks for his Information.

But his main Testimony is still behind, and yet it is so little to the purpose, that I had once almost a mind to have overlook'd it. He tells us,

pag. 29. That *Ignatius* the Glorious Martyr, who lived in the Days of the Apostles, in his Epistle to the *Smyrneans*, says, 'Let that Sacrament be judged Effectual and Firm which is dispensed by the Bishop, or him to whom the Bishop has committed it. It is not lawful, without the Bishop, either to baptize or celebrate the Offices; but what he approves of, according to the good Pleasure of God, that is Firm and Safe, and so we do every thing securely.' Our Author thinks this exactly agreeable to the Doctrine of St. *Cyprian*, and so he would deduce the Re-baptization of Hereticks and Schismaticks from the Apostles. But does *Ignatius* any where say, That Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were simply Invalid and to be repeated? He says, indeed, it is Unlawful, and not safe to baptize in opposition to the Bishop's Authority and Order. And so I believe any Man will say, that has a due respect for the Authority of the Episcopal Function. But does it hence follow, that all Baptisms are absolutely Invalid and Void, that a Schismatical Presbyter gives in opposition to his Bishop? It is unsafe, doubtless, either for Minister or People, the Baptizer or the Baptized, to be concerned in such Baptisms: They cannot with a safe Conscience, and without Sin, if Schism be a Sin, be either Agent or Patient in such Administrations; because they are acting in Contempt and Defiance of that Lawful Authority which God has appointed in his Church. But the way to correct these Errors is not to disannul the Sacrament by repeating it again, but to repent of the Unlawful Manner of Giving or Receiving it, in opposition to Lawful Authority and the Established Rules of the Church. But our Author, as I observed, always confounds Unauthorized-Baptism and

and Invalid-Baptism together; and if an Act be Sinful, Irregular, or Illegal in the Administrator, he presently concludes it must be Null and Void in the Receiver. Which is his great Mistake in his whole Book, and particularly in interpreting this Passage of *Ignatius*.

I shall but make one Remark more upon our Author's *Preliminary Discourse*, which is, in relation to his Opinion of the Invalidity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, which he thus expresses, *Pag. 27, and 28.* 'To return once more to the
' Dispute in *St. Cyprian's* Time, and the Decrees
' then and since made about it, I cannot dissemble
' my Thoughts, that the Arguments and Deter-
' minations against his Doctrine and Practice,
' have nothing of that Reason and Solidity which
' an Inquisitive Person might justly expect in
' them: And that, on the contrary, *St. Cyprian*
' and his Colleagues defend their Assertion, That
' the Baptisms of Hereticks and Scismaticks are
' Invalid, with so much Judgment and cogency
' of Argument, founded upon the Topick of such
' Hereticks and Schismaticks being destitute of
' Holy Orders while they were out of the Church
' of CHRIST, that I wonder how it could possibly
' have come to pass, that their Doctrine should be
' afterwards exploded; especially when I consider,
' that what they taught and practised herein, was
' confirmed by numerous Councils in those ear-
' lier days, wherein Truth was more prevalent
' than afterwards; and *Tertullian* long before affirm-
' ed the same thing. Nay, he says, *Ignatius* main-
' tained the very same Doctrine with *Cyprian*; and
' he thinks, nothing could have given Credit and
' Reputation to the contrary Opinion, but the
' monstrous increase of Heresy and Schism after-
wards,

wards, which, together with many other Causes concurring, brought into the Church of *Rome* and the rest of the *Western* Churches, whom she had subjected to her Vassalage, abundance of Damnable Doctrines and Practices, insomuch that at last there was but little of solid and substantial Religion to be found in the Churches of her Communion.

Now let us put these things together, and view them narrowly, and see what will be the Consequence. The Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics are Invalid: The Baptisms of the Church of *Rome* are the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics; or, in his words, the Baptisms of a Church that is over-run with abundance of damnable Doctrines and Practices, and has but little of solid or substantial Religion to be found in her Communion: Therefore the Baptisms of the Church of *Rome* are Invalid. Now if the Baptisms of the Church of *Rome* be Invalid, upon this Principle, that the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics are Invalid; What then becomes of the Validity of the Baptisms of the Church of *England*, and all the other Churches of the Reformation? Had they not all their Baptism from that Heretical Church of *Rome*, which, upon our Author's Principles, could not give Valid Baptism, much less the Power of Baptizing to others? Is not this as plain as any Demonstration in *Euclid*, or any one Syllable of an Argument in our Author's Book, that if the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics be Invalid; and the Church of *Rome* be an Heretical or Schismatical Church, and the Church of *England* have her Baptisms Originally from that Church and no other; that then the Consequence must be, that all the Baptisms of the Church of *England* are Invalid, and that there is
no

no true Baptism administred by her Priests any more than by any others. For they are all but pretended Priests, as having received their Baptism and Ordination originally from Hereticks and Schismaticks, who had no Power to minister any other Sacraments or Orders but such as are Invalid. I believe our Author did not see the Consequence of this Argument, which Unbaptizes all the Church of *England* at once, and himself among the rest, tho' he has been twice baptized or washed already. I know indeed, he declares (p. 31.) ' That it is not his Design to meddle with ' the Cyprianick Dispute in his Discourse; his ' Business is not to enquire, whether those who ' were once duly Authorized, and afterwards fall ' into Heresy or Schism, and thereby separate ' themselves, or are excluded from the Church, ' can administer Valid Sacraments and Ordinations ' during this their Separation: No, he will not so ' much as touch upon this at all, because he does ' not think his Case affected by it.' But he has already touched upon it, and freely declared his Opinion about it: And I have shewed him, what he did not think, that his Case is wonderfully affected by it; and not only his Case but the Case of all the Church of *England*, and all the Churches of the Reformation; which are all Unbaptized, and there is neither a Priest, nor a Christian among them, if the Principle he advances stand good, That the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismaticks is utterly Invalid: And he must seek for a Priest of another kind to Baptize him a third time with Valid Baptism, which he cannot have in the Church of *England*, nor the Church of *Rome*, nor the Churches of the Reformation, who all derive their Invalid Baptism from one and the same Original: He must travel then as far as *Constantinople* for

for a Priest of the *Greek Church* to do it: And when he comes there, he will, perhaps, find the same Difficulties in that Church, as his Principle makes in the rest of the *European Churches* nearer at hand. For in that Church, there may be some Question, whether there be not some Heretical or Schismatical Doctrines maintained? She has some of the *Romish Errors*; and to use an Expression of his, p. 30. too too much of her Leaven still remaining in her; One of her very great and peculiar Corruptions (as our Author styles it) in the matter of Lay-Baptism and Midwives-Baptism, is still espoused by that whole Church, as I have proved unanswerably against my learned Friend in the second Chapter of the foregoing Dissertation. To what Church then this Gentleman will apply himself for Valid-Baptism, I am at a loss to consider; and more at a loss to think by whom all the rest of *Christendom* are to be Re-baptized. But perhaps he will call this a Tragical Representation; as indeed it is, but it is a true one: He will complain, it may be, that I drive his Principle farther than he intended, and charge it with Consequences which he never thought of. I would charitably hope so indeed: But then I must say farther, it is proper to shew him the dangerous Consequences of his Opinion, in order to convince him of the Unreasonableness and Absurdity of it. But perhaps he will say, he neither believes Heretical and Schismatical Baptism to be Invalid, nor the Church of *Rome* to be that Heretical and Schismatical Church, which I have represented from his Character and Picture of her. The Reader will best judge of these things from his own Words before recited. But if he denies these to be his Opinions, I, for my part, will believe him; only beseeching him to express his Mind
a little

a little more intelligibly upon such Points for the future. And then I would ask him one Question more: If the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics be Valid, upon what Foot it is so? Is it because they have an equal Authority and Commission to baptize, as well as Catholick Priests? If so, whence is their Authority and Commission derived? Is it from the Catholick Bishops of the Church? But sure they never intend to authorize Hereticks and Schismatics to Baptize, or perform any other Ecclesiastical Offices, which belong to the Function of the Catholick Clergy. Or if they ordain Men to these Offices, who, as soon as they are ordained, turn Hereticks and Schismatics, and bid Defiance to the Church, and set up separate Meetings and Conventicles to perform those Offices, in direct Opposition to the Church and all her Orders; can it enter into any Man's Head to think, that they do all these by the Authority of the Bishops or the Church, who first gave them Ordination, when they are done so manifestly in Contempt of all Authority, and perhaps with a profest Design to affront Authority, and act Independently of themselves, without any Regard to the just Rules of Catholick Communion? No certainly, they forfeit all Legal Authority to perform such Offices, at least, after the Church pronounces a formal Sentence and Censure upon them. Now then the Question will be, whether any such Offices, and particularly Baptism, thus performed in Contempt of Authority, can be said to be Valid or not? That it is not Authoritatively performed is very plain: But does the thing done remain Valid, or is it therefore absolutely Null and Void, because the Heretical and Schismatical Priest had not the Authority of the Bishops of the Orthodox Church

to

to perform it? If it be Valid, then there may be a Valid Baptism where the Administrator is not Legally Authorized to perform it. If it be simply Invalid, and absolutely Null and Void, because administred by an Heretical or Schismatical Priest, then all the Difficulties return upon us that I have mentioned before, since our Baptisms originally descend from the Heretical and Schismatical Church of *Rome*: Which, if our Author thinks fit to deny to be an Heretical or Schismatical Church, I will undertake to shew it upon the general Principles of the Reformation. When these things are duly considered, they may, perhaps, have their proper Influence upon this Writer: At least I cannot but think that Venerable Body, who are competent Judges in this Matter, will make no new Decree, that will either reflect upon the general Practice of the Church, or make it so extremely difficult to defend the Baptisms of the Church of *England*, as it needs must be upon the Principles of this Author, who asserts the Nullity of Heretical Baptisms, as well as those of Laymen, tho' the Church of *England* has no Rule for Rebaptizing either; and by her constant Practice, which, in difficult Cases, is the best Interpreter of Rules, has allowed the Validity of both of them, as has been fully made out in the foregoing Discourse. I shall add no more but the handsome Rebuke, which St. *Jerom* gave *Hilary* the Deacon, the *Deucalion Orbis*, as he styles him, who was for Rebaptizing all that had been baptized by Hereticks, when they came over to the Unity of the Catholick Church: *Si Hæretici baptismum non habent, & ideo rebaptizandi ab Ecclesia sunt, quia in Ecclesia non fuerunt: ipse quoque Hilarius non est Christianus; in ea quippe Ecclesia baptizatus*

tus est, quæ semper ab Hæreticis baptismum recepit.
Hieron. Dial. contra Lucifer. cap. 9.

Our Author, I am told, understands *Latin*, and therefore I will leave him to translate this, and make the Application.

F I N I S.

BOOKS Printed for R. Knaplock, at the Bishop's
Head in St. Paul's Church-yard.

Origines *Ecclesiastica*: Or the Antiquities of the Christian Church. Vol. I. In two Books, whereof the first treats of Christians in general; their several Names and Degrees; of Catechumens, Laity, and Clergy: And the second gives a particular Account of the several Superior Orders and Offices in the Primitive Church. *The Second Edition.*

Origines Ecclesiastica: Vol. II. Giving an Account, I. Of the Inferior Orders of the Ancient Clergy. II. Of the manner of their Elections and Ordinations, and the Particular Qualifications of such as were to be Ordain'd. III. Of their Privileges, Immunities, and Revenues. IV. Of the several Laws relating to their Employment, Life and Conversation. *The Second Edition.*

Origines Ecclesiastica: Vol. III. Wherein is contained, I. An Account of the Ancient Asceticks. II. An Account of the Ancient Churches, their Original, Names, Parts, Utensils, Consecrations, Immunities, &c. III. A Geographical Description of the Districts of the Ancient Church, or, an Account of its division into Provinces, Dioceses, and Parishes, and of the first Original of these. The whole is illustrated with Cuts, Maps, and Indexes.

The *French Churches* Apology for the Church of *England*: Or, The Objections of Dissenters against the Articles, Homilies, Liturgy, and Canons of the *English Church*, consider'd and answer'd upon the Principles of the Reformed Church of *France*. A Work chiefly extracted out of the Authentick Acts and Decrees of the *French* National Synods, and the most approved Writers of that Church. These four by *J. Bingham*, Rector of *Headbourn Worthy*, near *Winchester*; and some time Fellow of *University College, Oxon*.

The Christian Pattern, or the Imitation of Jesus Christ: Vol. II. Being the Genuin Works of *Thomas à Kempis*. Containing four Books, viz. I. The Sighs of a Penitent Soul, or a Treatise of true Compunction. II. A short Christian Directory. III. Of Spiritual Exercises. IV. Of Spiritual Entertainments. Translated from the Original *Latin*, and recommended by *Dr. Hickes*. To which is prefix'd a large Account of the Author's Life and Writings.

A Defence of the Fifty fifth Canon, in answer to a Book, Entitl'd, *Reflections on Mr. Bennet's Discourse of Joint Prayer*. Humbly offer'd to the Clergy; with some Considerations, pleading for a strict Conformity to those Rules of the Church, and Laws of the Realm, which we have promis'd to obey. By *J. Bowtell*, B. D. and Fellow of *St. John's College in Cambridge*.

Bingham, Joseph, 1668-1723

A Scholastical History Of The Practice of the Church In reference to the
Administration of Baptism By Laymen ...

Bd.: [1]

London (1712)

Regensburg, Staatliche Bibliothek -- 999/Theol.syst.435(1/2
urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb11118136-7